ABSTRACT

Title of Document: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF
                            THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
                            ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
                            SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SUPERVISORS

                            Jane W. Spence, Doctor of Education, 2015

Directed By: Dr. Margaret McLaughlin, College of Education

This study explored elementary and secondary versions of a new principal supervisor

role in order to determine whether there might be marked differences in the functions

and responsibilities at each level. The new iteration of this role, which is becoming

increasingly popular in large urban school districts, requires those occupying it not

only to supervise principals but to improve their instructional leadership as well. This

new conception of the principal supervisor role is a change from the traditional work

of principal supervisors, which dealt more with ensuring compliance than with

coaching principals in instructional leadership.   However, despite the move to create

new expectations for principal supervisors as a group, there has been relatively little

research distinguishing between the work of those supervisors who serve elementary

schools and those who serve secondary schools. It is important to examine the

functions and responsibilities of these positions at both elementary and secondary

levels to determine if the resources of secondary school principal supervisors need to

be different from those of their elementary counterparts. This study was intended to inform this question through observation and interviews of a select group of secondary supervisors in one district focused on responsibilities for individual schools, supervisors' expected impact on school-related district priorities, and allocation of time by responsibility.

AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL
PRINCIPAL SUPERVISORS

By

Jane W. Spence

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
2015

Advisory Committee:
Dr. Margaret McLaughlin, Chair
Dr. Thomas Davis
Dr. John Norris
Dr. Stephanie Timmons-Brown
Dr. Donna Wiseman

Acknowledgements

To my best friend and loving husband, Mr. Craigton Ricardo Spence: Clearly, I could not have done this without you—your faith in me, your true love (putting my needs, dreams and desires above your own), your selflessness, and your impeccable fatherhood. I cannot put into words how much I appreciate your support this last three years, but since we have always had telepathic communication skills, no words are necessary. I love you.

To my only daughter, Seren Amanda Spence: Thank you for lending your mother to the University of Maryland at the tender age of 8, and waiting excruciatingly patiently to get her back. Thank you for maintaining that straight "A" average at Tulip Grove, so that your mother would not succumb to the nagging feeling that she was neglecting you, and for not complaining that much about being unable to participate in track, soccer or gymnastics. Thankfully, your life has taken a turn for the better, and you now have not only debate, the National Junior Honor Society, and all of the other countless joys of middle school, you also have your mother back.

To my only son, Nathan Ricardo Spence: Thank you for praying for me when I felt like I was on the edge. You've always known how to get a prayer through, and that is remarkable since you are only ten. Thank you also for not turning to a life of crime while your mother was immersed in her studies. Third grade was difficult, but you navigated it like a champion, even when your mother's stress level made the

homework checking atmosphere a bit more caustic than one might expect. You are the best son ever.

Thank you to Ms. Elaine Tune—otherwise known as my mother. Your encouraging words and wisdom have been water in the desert. Thank you also for setting me on this journey, by sitting with me at the kitchen table of a small apartment in the Bronx, and listening to me read aloud about whatever eight-year-olds like to read, and pretending you were just as interested as I was.

To my committee: Thank you for looking past my obvious flaws (obstinacy, quirkiness, garrulousness to name a few) and for choosing instead to nurture my fervor, curiosity, and love for education. I learned things I didn't even know I didn't know—(Pearson R? Kendall's Tau? T-Scores? really?) but I felt so much smarter after every single class (i.e. Oooooohhh—that's what that little number means!). The program's title implies equipping participants to lead school systems, and ironically, I feel equipped to do just that. This program has been life-changing, and I earnestly appreciate the opportunity to participate in it. Dr. McLaughlin, you are one smart woman. You are also exceptionally hard-working, incredibly fast, and patient. When I met you, I was afraid. You are small but mighty, and that comes across immediately. However, I cannot imagine an advisor more responsive and thoughtful than you have been. Thank you.

To my PGCPS cohort and family: Thank you for the Twizzlers, the laughs, and the intellectual stimulation. You actually made weekends in class something to which I could look forward. Kristil Fossett, you are a superhero, and you are my inspiration. Tamika, thank you for talking me down off of the ledge and back into the classroom. It has been a breathtaking three years.

Thank you to God. You are everything.

v

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Background of the Study

Section 1-Introduction to the Problem

By 2013, a number of large urban school districts had established a new version of the principal supervisor role that required those occupying the position not only to supervise principals but to improve these principals' instructional leadership as well. Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton, and Newton (2010) in their study of leadership for learning improvement, called these executive staff instructional leadership directors (ILDs) and described their job as fostering "unique central office - principals partnerships" (2010, p. 56). Other school systems used titles such as Area Leadership Directors, Superintendents, and Instructional Directors (Corcoran et al., 2013) but the work was similar. Those occupying these positions (who may be referenced as principal supervisors or PSs in this study) were charged with improving the instructional leadership of principals so that these key leaders were better equipped to elevate the overall academic achievement of students in their buildings. The PS positions were a change from the traditional work of principal managers, which (according to Honig et al.) was to "handle business...or regulatory functions, such as ensuring that teaching staff met standards for licensure" (Gamson, 2009a, 2009b; Honig, et. al., 2010, p. 6).

However, despite the move to create new roles and responsibilities for principal supervisors as a whole, there has been relatively little research distinguishing between the work of those supervisors who serve elementary schools and those who serve secondary schools. Examining the functions and responsibilities

of these positions through the lens of levels served is necessary to determine if the resources of secondary school principal supervisors need to be different from those of their elementary counterparts. This study can also inform whether the responsibilities tied to these positions, might need to be distinct at each level, in order to equally elevate all principals' instructional leadership capacities. To this end, this study explored elementary and secondary school principal supervisors' perceptions of their supervisory or supportive responsibilities for individual schools, their expected impact on school-related district priorities, the amount of time spent meeting the varied demands of their position, and their ability to allocate desired amounts of time to their core work.

Section 2-Critical Literature

Critical literature linking principals' leadership and student achievement.

The focus on using the principal supervisor role to develop principals is based on the belief that principal prowess can positively impact student achievement. Many researchers have proposed that more effective principals can help resolve the problem of low student achievement (Augustine et al., 2009; Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007; Farkas, Johnson & Duffett, 2003; Honig, 2012; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Leithwood, Patten & Jantzi, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). According to Christine DeVita, 2011 president of The Wallace Foundation, "It turns out that leadership not only matters: it is second only to teaching among school-related factors in its impact on student learning" (Leithwood et al., 2004, p. 3).

While some might have taken this finding for granted, there had been previous research that could be used to reach a different conclusion. Witziers, Bosker, and Kruger (2003) conducted a quantitative meta-analysis of research to study effects of leadership on achievement. Although they agreed that educational leadership affects student achievement, they found that effect sizes were small (ranging from .02-.19). However, this research focused on reviewing research on direct effects (the unmitigated impact of one variable on another).

Research that studied both direct and indirect effects told a different story. An indirect effect is a case in which the impact of one variable on another is mediated by one or more other variables. The power of studying the indirect effect of principal leadership on student achievement was evident as early as 1996, when a Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis study sought to determine whether there was relationship among school context (things like the socio-economic status of students and parental involvement), principal instructional leadership, instructional climate and student reading achievement. Though the researchers found no direct effect, they found that through factors related to school climate, principals do have an indirect effect on student achievement.

Other researchers built upon the idea that principal impact might better be measured indirectly. The work of Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) studied both direct and indirect effects (cases in which the impact of one variable on another is mediated by one or more other variables) and posited that "existing research actually underestimates" the effects of leadership on student achievement (p.5). Leithwood et al. (2004) referenced Waters, Marzano, and

McNulty (2003) who "calculated a 10% increase in student test scores of an average principal who improved her demonstrated abilities in 21 responsibilities by one standard deviation" (Leithwood et al., p. 22). Leithwood, Patten and Jantzi's study (2010) found similar results. When they conceived that leadership influences student achievement along "distinct paths" (i.e., rational, emotional, organizational and family) their research revealed leadership as having the strongest effects through academic press and disciplinary climate. The above research shows that principals can have an indirect impact on student achievement. It can also be used to support the idea that principals are worth investments to improve their practice.

Critical literature that defines effective principals. Because the role of principal seems to hold measurable promise for elevating student achievement, many school districts have chosen to devote significant resources to developing the skills of these key leaders (Honig et al., 2010; Honig, 2012; Leithwood et al., 2004). The Wallace Foundation (2011) defined those skills as:

- Shaping a vision of academic success for all students,

- Creating a climate hospitable to education,

- Cultivating leadership in others,

- Improving instruction, and

- Managing people, data, and processes to foster school improvement (p. 2).

Isolating the skill of instructional improvement, Honig (2012) contended that instructional leadership is an "important contributor to improved teaching, and in some studies, student achievement gains" (p. 736). She further synthesized various research into a definition of instructional leadership as "leadership [that] involves

principals working intensively and continuously with teachers to examine evidence of the quality of their teaching and to use that evidence to improve how they teach" (p.736).

Similarly, Leithwood et al. (2004) linked the following leadership skills to student achievement:

- Setting directions (defined as helping a group develop shared understandings about the organization and its activities and goals to undergird a vision);

- Developing people (defined as offering intellectual stimulation, individualized support, and an appropriate model); and

- Redesigning the organization (defined as strengthening school cultures, modifying organizational structures and building collaborative processes, p. 23).

Some large urban school systems felt a heightened sense of urgency to develop the above skills in their principals because the student achievement in these districts was so problematic. To develop these principals, they used principal supervisors.

Section 3-Justification of the Problem

Context for the problem. Raising student achievement is a major focus of all schools, but can be particularly challenging for large urban school systems, that serve a diverse and high-poverty student population, because students in these districts generally need increased amounts of support in order to meet expectations. I have spent my entire central office career helping principals meet the challenges of serving students in these school systems.

As a secondary school principal supervisor in a large urban school system, which will be referenced as School System A, I noticed firsthand the district's valiant attempt to address its flagging student achievement by utilizing acclaimed leaders as principal supervisors. Yet, despite the district's best efforts, issues with student achievement persisted at the high school level. While there may have been many reasons for this, one reason that struck me while I served in the role of principal supervisor was the lack of time I had to dedicate to what I perceived to be my core work. There were so many *very* important demands that usurped my time (such as parent complaints, graduation preparation, and teacher evaluation conferences) that I felt stymied in doing what I felt was *most* important (i.e. coaching principals). Concurrently, I noticed that while time was also an issue for my counterparts who primarily served elementary schools, they seemed to be able to allocate greater levels of their time to our core work. When one of my colleagues pointed out that high school principal supervisors actually served almost three times the number of constituents (18,000 students) as elementary principal supervisors (7,400 students) I began to wonder if the role and/or responsibilities of the high school principal supervisor position might need to be more closely examined. After my tenure in School System A, I transitioned to another large urban school system--School System B, into a role that directly supervised principal supervisors. In this role, I felt personally responsible for ensuring that secondary principal supervisors had adequate time to dedicate to their core work, as defined by Honig (2012). This determination prompted my commitment to study the functions and responsibilities of both levels of

principal supervisors to determine if there was indeed a difference that might impact the resources they needed or the ways their roles should be defined.

Leadership challenges in large urban school systems. Both systems in which I served are large urban school districts, and they serve similar populations. In 2013, System A enrolled over 100,000 students in 205 schools in grades K-12. Thirty of those schools were high schools (including three alternative schools for *at-risk* students); 169 were middle or elementary schools, and six were turnaround schools. This number included 64.7% African-American, 25.8% Hispanic, and 4.5% White students. Of those students, 63% were categorized as "economically disadvantaged" (because they received meals free or at a reduced price) approximately 15% were limited English proficient (sometimes called English Language Learners), and approximately 12% of students received special education services (Maryland State Department of Education, MSDE, 2013; Prince George's County Public Schools, PGCPS, 2014a). In 2013, to serve these students, School System A had 14 principal supervisors.

In comparison, School System B served approximately 45,557 students in K-12 in 111 schools in 2013. Of those schools, 15 were dedicated high schools serving grades 9-12, 60 were elementary schools serving K-6, 9 were middle schools, and 18 were education campuses (two of which served grades 6-12, and 16 of which served grades K-8). The remaining schools were set aside for adult education, special education, and incarcerated youths. In 2013, 69% of the population of School System B was Black, 16% was Hispanic, and 11% of the population was White. Additionally, 77% of students received free or reduced lunch (a proxy for being

economic disadvantaged) 10% were English language learners and 17% of the population received special education services, (District of Columbia Public Schools, DCPS, 2014). In 2013, to serve these students, School System B had ten principal supervisors.

In 2013, System A was determined to ensure that 100% of its students graduated high school "college and career ready." This was a laudable goal, and one I, as a principal supervisor, was determined to meet. Yet, that year, only 74% of the predominantly minority population of this school system met the goal of graduating within four years. Average SAT scores were 1205 (which was significantly less than the national SAT score of 1498). Advanced Placement exam results also failed to meet national standards. Advanced Placement exams are administered by the College Board, and can help students prepare for the rigors of college. In some cases, scores between three and five on these exams can earn students college credit. In School System A, there were 5,807 exams taken, representing 16% of the high school student population. Of these, 26% of the exams earned passing scores of three to five (PGCPS, 2014a). These data meant only about four percent of the high school population successfully passed an AP exam. (It is important to note that this number may inflate the actual number of students as it is possible for some students to take and pass multiple exams).

The similarities between School System A and School System B are remarkable. In School System B, only an alarming 56% of students graduated in four years (OSSE, 2013) and average SAT scores were 1200 (Washington Post, 2013). In this district, there were 4,123 Advanced Placement exams taken, representing about

35% of the population and students earned passing scores on 30.8% of those AP exams (DCPS, internal source). These data meant about 10.78% of School System B's high school students successfully passed an Advanced Placement exam. When the pass rates of both school districts (four percent and 11%) are compared to the national average of 20.1% of public high school graduates earning a three or better on an Advanced Placement exam, it is evident there is an issue with student achievement in these large urban school systems.

This is a problem. In the 21st century, students need much more complex skills than students who graduated in the last century (The Conference Board, 2006). Edward Gordon (2009), an expert in workforce prediction, stated that the percentage of jobs requiring two-year to four-year degrees and higher will rise to 75% of U.S. jobs by the year 2020. He further "estimated that the United States will lack the talent to fill anywhere from 12 to 24 million essential jobs throughout our economy" (p. 29). This prediction shows how pressing it is for school systems to explore all options for improving the achievement and outcomes of those closest to entering the workforce--their secondary school students.

Section 4-Analysis of Prior Attempts to Address the Problem

Improving principal capacity in urban schools. Both systems A and B recognized the importance of having effective principals to address student achievement challenges such as the ones described above. System B developed leadership standards that defined effective principals as those who could:

1. Establish a shared vision and goals for student achievement and use a deep knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment to achieve the school's vision and goals;

2. Attract, select, develop and retain key talent to maximize staff members' performance and student learning;

3. Create and sustain a strong school culture that supports an effective learning environment;

4. Ensure efficient school operations and resource management to maximize student learning;

5. Exercise effective engagement of families and community members to ensure their meaningful involvement in student learning and school success; and

6. Demonstrate reflective, solution-oriented, culturally proficient, and resilient leadership. (DCPS, 2014, pp. 16-42)

In 2009, School System A developed eight leadership standards that were still in use six years later. These standards defined effective principals as those who:

1. Set high expectations for achievement based upon individualized tailoring of instruction, rigorous data analysis and evaluation of effective instructional practices;

2. Set standards for ensuring school-wide instructional and achievement goals are met based upon implementation of effective pedagogical practices, data analysis and monitoring of research-based instructional practices;

3. Monitor effective instructional practices through observation and evaluation;

4. Build a shared vision, foster shared goals, and communicate high performance expectations;

5. Demonstrate a commitment to excellence, equity, and innovation;

6. Demonstrate human resource and managerial leadership;

7. Demonstrate strong external leadership; and

8. Demonstrate knowledge of the use of technology and data. (PGCPS, 2013c, p. 4)

The above definitions of leadership in large urban school systems contain common elements (e.g. instructional leadership, building the capacity of others, and managing other aspects of the school program). These commonalities allow principals and those who supervise them to draw from a robust and largely coherent body of information on what it takes to be an effective principal. However, knowing effective practice and cultivating it are two different things, and both systems recognized the need to build the capacity of its building leaders. This realization prompted the consideration of principal supervisors as professional developers of principals.

School System A stated in its theory of action for reform that it intended to give "maximum freedom" and "maximum control over school operations and instruction" to schools, then hold them accountable for meeting standards (PGCPS, 2008, p.6). Because of this, it became imperative that principals in that system demonstrate competency in all areas of the principalship. Professional development

played a prominent role in this theory of action. About it, the Board of Education wrote, "In short, to meet high standards, all involved in our educational enterprise need knowledge, skills, and tools appropriate to the task. Building this capacity is the responsibility of the board/superintendent team" (PGCPS, 2008, p.8).

In a similar vein, the highest ranking leader of School System B wrote in 2013, "Highly effective school leaders help everyone improve, including students, teachers and staff members…The information provided [by evaluations] helps [the district] make strategic decisions about how to use our resources to best support you"(DCPS, 2014, p. 4).   Also, this leader made the following promise to principals,

> Quality feedback is a key element of the improvement process. You will receive formal feedback including discussion of your strengths as well as your areas of growth, from your instructional superintendent twice each year. In addition, the current cluster structure guarantees regular formative feedback from your instructional superintendent, who is expected to be in your schools at least once every two weeks. (DCPS, 2014, p.4)

Previous attempts at professional development for principals. Clearly both System A and B were very focused on developing effective principals. In "The Professional Development of Principals: Innovations and Opportunities," Peterson (2002) proposed that professional development for principals should include the following structural arrangements and cultural elements:

- A clear mission and purpose to drive decision-making and design
- Curriculum and coherence
- Utilization of a variety of instructional strategies

- A link to state initiatives and certification

- Use of informational technologies

- Use of both all-day and multiple-session meetings over the entire year.

- Inclusion of cultural elements such as program culture and symbols (pp.214-217).

In 2011, System A attempted to meet the needs of professional development for principals through five separate programs, all of which had at least some of the above elements of effective practice:

- School Leaders Network, established four "communities of practice" of 15 principals each from various levels (with one established just for secondary school principals), and used mentoring and direct instruction to help those principals grow in instructional leadership and community partnership;

- The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), Leadership Immersion Institute and National Principals Mentor Certification Program used mentoring and coaching to support the 33 new principals of all levels and to develop veteran principals as mentors" (PGCPS, 2011b, p.6).

- The National Institute of School Leaders (NISL) in 2011 developed 19 practicing principals in the knowledge and skills necessary to become "dynamic instructional leaders focused on accelerating student learning,"(PGCPS, 2011b, p.6).

- Ending in 2011, the Leadership Education for Aspiring Principals'

   Program (LEAPP) was designed to enhance the professional practice

   of 12 assistant principals and central office administrators and to

   potentially prepare them to be successful principals (PGCPS, 2011b),

   and

- The Aspiring Leaders Program for Student Success, which began in

   2012, was designed to train 25 aspiring principals through direct

   instruction, mentoring and internships to meet the county's new eight

   leadership standards. (PGCPS, 2012a)

Elements of Peterson's best practices could be found in many of these

programs. All attempted to align their missions with that of School System A, had

coherent curricula, used various instructional strategies, trained participants in

informational technology, linked to state initiatives and certification, and possessed

established symbols and cultures (2002, pp. 214-217). All five of the programs in

system A helped leaders resolve a few problems through case studies or mentoring.

However, none could be flexible enough to train principals in *all* of the new

initiatives they were expected to master and spearhead because each program had

specific, fixed curricula and parameters that needed to be followed. For instance,

none of the above programs shepherded principals through the student-based budget

process, a process integral to the success of their schools; nor could they assist

principals with navigating the new evaluation system, a system developed after the

curriculum was written for many of these programs.

Additionally, participation in these programs was voluntary; meaning those principals most in need of the programs might not have received the services provided. Furthermore, there were so many programs available that during my tenure as a principal supervisor in that district, colleagues, principals and aspiring principals expressed confusion over the purposes of each and how each program related to the others. Finally, despite the concerted efforts to develop principals in School System A, there was no formal evaluation of the effectiveness of these principal development programs, nor whether or not secondary school principals in these programs or their supervisors had different needs from their elementary counterparts.

School System B also attempted to develop its principals in a variety of ways.

- In 2012-13, the district introduced a leadership series designed to meet principals' differentiated professional development needs (i.e., content expertise; adaptive leadership, diversity/equity, etc., District of Columbia Department of Education, 2013; personal communication, January 30, 2015).

- In 2012, approximately 40 turnaround schools and School Improvement Grant schools were given access to experienced principal partners to provide daily coaching and guidance. These principal coaches supported up to three schools each and also helped to familiarize principals with district practices. They even supported schools while their principals attended professional development and assisted principals in overseeing key initiatives (District of Columbia

Department of Education, 2013; personal communication, January 30, 2015).

- In 2013, the district launched a fellowship with the goal of identifying and nurturing current district staff in order to prepare them for district principal positions. Twelve fellows participated in an 18-month program aligned to the district's leadership standards and to the distinct needs of a turnaround school principalship. The program included coaching, direct instruction, and residencies in two different schools (District of Columbia Department of Education, 2013; personal communication, January 30, 2015).

- Also, in 2013, the district provided sizable scholarships to 25 district staff who pursued 10-month, district-tailored versions of an executive master's degree in leadership at a prestigious local university. The curriculum centered around such tenets as operating with passion and purpose, dealing with uncertainty, improving motivational speaker skills, and engaging in difficult conversations, (DCPS, 2014b).

All of these programs showed District B's commitment to developing its principals and some met all or almost all of the elements of Peterson's effective professional development tenets. For instance, the fellowships and master's degrees offered had clear missions and purposes; curriculum and coherence; used a variety of instructional strategies; could be linked to certification; used cultural symbols, and had both all-day and intermittent sessions throughout the course of the year.

As was the case with District A, none of these programs could meet all principals' professional needs. The leadership series, for instance, was optional; which meant those principals most in need of the professional learning may not have received it. Additionally, there was no explicit push to ensure that the series met the criteria of effective professional development, which meant the quality and effectiveness of the series could not be assured. As for principal coaches, only 40 (out of 126) School Improvement Grant or Turnaround schools (the lowest achieving schools) received them, which meant less than half of the district's schools had access to that resource. Finally, both the master's cohort and the fellowship program served only a select few of the principals in the district, and since both had a rigorous screening process, there was the potential for those few served to be the highest performing staff in the district. Conversely, those who needed the support the most could be denied access to the programs.

In both districts, despite robust professional development offerings, there was still evidence of large numbers of principals failing to receive coherent, systematic, effective professional development. This was an issue since student achievement outcomes showed that principals were definitely in need of support.

Principal supervisors as professional development providers. In 2010, to address the professional development needs noted above, the Wallace Foundation funded a research effort, joined by researchers such as Honig, Leithwood, LaPointe and others, to find the best way to develop effective principals. One method of principal development that aligned with the foundation's research in school systems such as Atlanta Public Schools, New York City's Empowerment Schools, Oakland

Unified School District, District of Columbia Public Schools and Prince George's County Public Schools, was the creation of principal supervisor positions specifically designed to support principal professional development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Honig et al., 2010; Honig, 2012). Honig et al., in their study of leadership for learning improvement, called these executive staff *instructional leadership directors (ILDs)* and described their job as fostering "unique central office - principals partnerships" (p. 56). In the Honig et al. research on these positions, the researchers determined that those principal supervisors who were most effective, supported principals through providing differentiated assistance, modeling, developing and using tools, brokering external resources and engaging principals as resources for each other (Honig, 2010).

Honig et al. (2010) propagated the idea that "central office administrators [should] fundamentally remake their work practices and their relationships with schools in support of teaching and learning improvements for all students" (p. 9). School System A agreed with this idea and created its own iteration of the principal supervisor position espoused by Honig. These central office staff members were called Instructional Directors.

To support this type of new structure Honig et al. encouraged school systems to "lead through, not around" (p.63) the principal supervisors. Accordingly, School System A aligned the design of its new positions with this thinking, writing policies and establishing practices to ensure that all things related to principals and schools went through their principal supervisors. Tasks that went through principal supervisors included budget reviews, school improvement plan reviews, records

reviews, parent complaints, staff grievances, staffing, administrative transfers, special

education compliance oversight, emergency management, building cleanliness

oversight, discrimination and harassment case review, promotion and retention

decisions and field trips for all fifteen schools.   In School System A, in addition to

the supports mentioned above, principal supervisors of all levels of were charged with

providing strategic professional development to clusters of approximately 15

principals each.

By 2013, School System B had 10 principal supervisors. This was a

significant increase from the five principal supervisors previously used to serve the

district's 130 schools. In the 2013 iteration, five of these leaders served elementary

schools exclusively, two served high schools exclusively, one served alternative

schools, (which primarily served over-aged, under-credited students) one served

education campuses, which often blended grade levels (i.e., K-8), and one principal

supervisor served middle schools exclusively. In District B, the number of students

served was more balanced than School System A, with the average elementary school

principal supervisor serving approximately 4,938 students, while the average

secondary school principal supervisor served approximately 6,300 students. While

high school principal supervisors still served approximately 1,500 more students than

their elementary school counterparts, the disparity of population sizes served was

much lower than in School System A. This relatively equitable distribution of student

populations served made it all the more possible to see whether or not there were

other factors (such as scheduling complexities, graduation requirements, and

management of extra-curricular activities) that made the position of secondary school

principal supervisor significantly different than that of the elementary principal supervisor.

Some other large, urban school districts had structures remarkably similar to School Systems A and B while others had key differences. For example, the Atlanta Public Schools called its principal supervisors Executive Directors. In 2011, each Executive Director in Atlanta had 17 schools, but of those schools approximately 10 were elementary schools, four were middle schools, and three were high schools. The 47,000 students in Atlanta public schools were divided into four clusters. This division meant each principal supervisor was responsible for approximately 11,700 students. In 2011, Baltimore County had a model similar to that of School System A, except that its principal supervisors were called Assistant Superintendents and supervised schools divided by levels. There were five Assistant Superintendents for elementary schools, three for middle schools, and two for high schools. The five elementary school Assistant Superintendents shared two executive administrative assistants and one parent liaison. The three Assistant Superintendents for middle schools shared one executive administrative assistant, and the two high school Assistant Superintendents shared an executive administrative assistant, a resource teacher, and an administrative secretary. In 2011, Baltimore City Public Schools also transitioned to Executive Directors as the primary supervisor of principals. The ten Executive Directors all shared one administrative assistant, and like School System A principal supervisors had no other support staff.

Section 5-Investigation

  Research on the roles and impacts of principal supervisors. There is a gap in the research related to how principal supervisors may function at elementary versus secondary schools—especially in large urban school systems. The current iteration of the principal supervisor role is relatively new; so much of the current research has focused on defining the role, rather than differentiating it by level. In the 2010 research that served to highlight the emerging role of the instructionally focused principal supervisor, Honig, et al. described how this central office role would need to be redesigned to move away from compliance-related activities into supporting the improvement of teaching and learning. However, the research stopped short of describing how this work might differ between elementary or secondary schools. In her 2012 follow-up work, Honig went into a much deeper description of the role of the principal supervisor, sharing the five practices that help effective principal supervisors have optimal impact (modeling, brokering, creating and sustaining social engagement, developing and using tools, and focusing on joint work). However, she did not discuss whether the application of these practices was impacted by the level of the school being supported (i.e. elementary, middle or high schools). In fact, there was little information provided on what the levels of the principal supervisors were in this study, other than what could be gleaned from ancillary details provided, such as grade levels of analyzed data (Honig, 2012).

  Even though Honig did not discuss whether the work of principal supervisors was impacted by the level of the schools they served, there is research that suggests there are distinctions between elementary and secondary schools which could affect

the work done by their respective principal supervisors. Unfortunately, this research

on the differences between elementary and secondary school needs is scant and dated.

Firestone, Herriott and Wilson (1984) showed that secondary schools are more

"loosely linked" than elementary schools, meaning they are "organizations where the

actions of individuals are [more] poorly coordinated" (p. 7). The authors went on to

explain two areas of linkage that are particularly relevant to the work of principal

supervisors. Specifically, the authors pointed out that "influence is less centralized,"

and that there is "less agreement on goals" (p.7). Because part of the charge of

principals as instructional leaders is to unify staff around a vision of effective

instruction and ensure that this instruction is exemplified uniformly throughout their

schools (Wallace Foundation, 2011; Leithwood et al., 2004; DCPS, 2014; PGCPS,

2013c), this study could provoke districts to consider whether the role of secondary

principal supervisor should be approached differently than it is at the elementary

level.

Firestone et al. (1984) also cited earlier studies that showed the loose coupling

of secondary schools could affect the effectiveness of change efforts—especially for

minority students, as teachers may need to change their practice in order to serve best

this population. Since much of the work of large urban districts focuses on minority

populations, this means that these findings could be especially relevant for the

districts examined as a part of the current study.

Kmetz (1982) noted, "compared with secondary principals…the elementary

principals' pace was less hectic, and they spent more time on the instructional

program" (p. 62).   Helping secondary principals navigate through whatever elements

of their programs create this uniquely "hectic" environment, and carve out time for instructional leadership, would be paramount for the secondary principal supervisor.

There is more recent research supporting the idea that work at the secondary level differs from that at the elementary level. Wexler (2004) wrote in her work on the implementation of response-to-intervention at the secondary level that,

the secondary level is considerably different from ….the elementary level, for many reasons that are fundamental to secondary instruction. For example, whereas elementary students often have one or two academic teachers, secondary students may have five or six. Scheduling at the elementary level is largely controlled at the classroom level by teachers.

Secondary…implementation requires consideration of the fact that most students change classes frequently throughout the day; often do not have the same teachers for their core academic courses as their classmates do; are enrolled in courses based on graduation requirements for certain credits or Carnegie units; and are further constricted in scheduling by the placement of uniquely offered elective courses and/or co- curricular activities occurring during the school day. (p.7)

Finally, Cotton (2003) determined that while principals at all levels identified evaluation; culture and climate; goal articulation; and promoting an orderly climate for learning as their top priorities, secondary principals "spend substantially less time on key instructional tasks than do elementary principals" (p.54). This conclusion is supported by the work of Teddlie and Reynolds (2000) who posited that because of the abundance of content specialization in secondary schools, "it is probably

impossible for a secondary principal to be an expert in all instructional areas covered by secondary curriculum" (as cited in Cotton, 2003, p. 55).   Thus, while it is important not to assume that the roles of principal supervisors are *harder* or *easier* at the elementary or secondary levels, it certainly is worthwhile to explore if the work of principal supervisors at both levels is *different,* and to examine what, if any, implications these findings will have for districts.

Purpose of the study. This study explored the work of principal supervisors at the elementary and secondary school levels in a large urban school system (School System B) by assessing elementary and secondary school principal supervisors' perceptions of the following:

- Their supervisory/support responsibilities for individual schools (i.e. the core work they decided to perform to support their individual schools);

- Their expected impact on school-related district priorities (meaning how they were expected to assist with district priorities for schools in general);

- The amount of time they spent meeting the varied demands of their position; and

- Their ability to allocate desired amounts of time to their core work (as defined by Honig, 2012 and their district's leadership standards).

Both District A and District B served important (though different) roles in this study. This study is grounded in my experience with District A, where I served as both a principal and principal supervisor; but it is conducted in District B. My

24

experience as a principal supervisor in District A helped me understand the importance of the principal supervisor role, and also opened my eyes to the possibility that elementary and secondary principal supervisors might need to approach their work differently. It also helped me realize and articulate why differences between levels (if they existed) might be a barrier to principal development and student success. Additionally, my District A experience helped me understand the power of using best practices, such as those identified by Honig, to define what the principal supervisor work looks like when it is done well.

However, the actual study was conducted in District B because it is through my position as Deputy Chief (a supervisor of principal supervisors) in District B that I finally have the opportunity to create or implement systems that will help principal supervisors function at optimal levels. The fact that Districts A and B have so many similarities has made what I learned in one district much more transferable to the work and the study done in the other.

Findings from this study may have implications for a number of school systems which, like the urban school systems described in this section, are looking to the supervisors of principals to provide the job-embedded support and professional development that principals will need in order to tackle the myriad challenges in their buildings. There is no evidence that other systems have examined whether there are differences in how principal supervisors meet the needs of their respective principals at different levels. This study is only an initial step in the process of evaluating the most effective way to implement the principal supervisor role, as the role is still relatively new in education. However, this research will be important in the battle to

ensure consistently high-quality instructional programs in all schools, no matter what

the level. Therefore, it may help districts in their quest to increase numbers of

students graduating ready for college and careers (Honig et al., 2004; Honig, 2012;

Leithwood et al., 2004).

Chapter 2: Investigation

Section 1-Research Methodology

Research questions. By 2013, a number of large urban school districts had

established a new iteration of the principal supervisor position in order to improve

principals' instructional leadership and thus, the academic achievement of students.

However, despite the move to create new roles and responsibilities for principal

supervisors as a group, there has been relatively little research distinguishing between

the functions and responsibilities of those principal supervisors who serve elementary

schools versus those who serve secondary schools. This study explored the

perceptions of principal supervisors at the elementary and secondary school levels

regarding their supervisory and support-related responsibilities to their individual

schools, their expected impact on school-related district priorities, the amount of time

they spent meeting the varied demands of their position, and their ability to allocate

desired amounts of time to their core work. The following research questions were

addressed:

1. What aspects of their *school programs* do principal supervisors decide to

   supervise or support at their individual schools and do these differ

   between elementary and secondary school principal supervisors?

2. What school-related *district priorities* do principal supervisors perceive

   they are expected to impact, and do these perceptions differ between

   elementary and secondary school supervisors?

3. What *proportion of their time* do elementary and secondary school principal supervisors devote to *work inside and outside of schools* and for which purposes?

4. What *proportion of their time* do elementary and secondary school principal supervisors devote to each *Honig's five key supports*, and to supporting principals in developing their skills along the *district's leadership standards*?

Theoretical framework. This research was grounded in the theoretical framework of Honig (2010), which posited that the core work of principal supervisors should be to support principals by engaging in the following:

1. Differentiating support--consistently providing supports tailored to principals' instructional leadership capacity;

2. Modeling--demonstrating best practices;

3. Developing and using tools--providing templates or other materials that principals can use in their everyday work;

4. Brokering--protecting principals from external distractions and connecting them with necessary resources or materials; and

5. Creating and sustaining social engagement--facilitating focused interactions with other practitioners (p. vi).

Honig's framework was used to articulate what current research suggests the core work of principal supervisors should be. It is important to note that while Honig's 2010 research grounds this study, it cannot be assumed that the principal supervisors included in this study were familiar with this research or that they agreed with

Honig's identification of the five strategies. Still, it was important to have some accepted standard of practice for principal supervisors through which to observe and analyze the data. This was particularly important because District B had not yet adopted performance standards or job-specific evaluations for its principal supervisors that could be used to define a set of common practices. Additionally, Honig's research was supported by the Wallace Foundation, a group that had affiliations with numerous districts in 24 states. For this reason, I felt the best practices identified in her research could serve as a foundation for my study.

Besides the best practices articulated by Honig, my study also measured the extent to which the support provided by principal supervisors was perceived to align with the leadership standards expressed in School System B's appraisal tool (reference Chapter 1 of this proposal, pp. 9-10).

Section 2-Research Design

Because the current model of the principal supervisor is so new, and information on supervisors at different levels is so scant, the proposed study used a qualitative research design to develop four case studies (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006; Honig et al. 2010; Honig, 2012). According to Gay et al.,

> Qualitative research is the collection, analysis and interpretation of comprehensive narrative and visual data in order to gain insights into a particular phenomenon of interest. The purposes of qualitative research are broad in scope and center around promoting a deep and holistic or complex understanding of a particular phenomenon, such as an environment, a process or even a belief. (p. 399)

In this case, the qualitative research process allowed me to observe directly the everyday support provided by principal supervisors to both elementary and secondary school principals. It also afforded me the opportunity to dive deeply into the perspectives of principal supervisors to determine their rationales for providing specific supports to individual schools in the ways that they do and to glean the perspectives of principal supervisors on what should change about the position. This information was collected in order to develop four case studies.

Case studies allow researchers to "explore or describe a phenomenon" and can be used to "develop theory, evaluate programs and develop interventions" (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544). They also provide opportunities for participants to "tell stories and describe their views of reality"; and for "researchers to better understand participants" (Crabtree & Miller, 1999; Lather, 1992; Robottom & Hart, 1993, as cited in Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 545). Here, the case study approach allowed me to explore whether or not there is a marked difference in the roles and responsibilities of elementary and secondary principal supervisors, and may help future researchers develop theories based on those findings. Although these findings are not generalizable because of the small sample size, the voices heard through the case study methodology may resonate with districts or educational researchers who find themselves with similar questions. Consequently, this research could prompt them to embark on their own studies to evaluate how elementary and secondary principal supervisors are utilized and/or resourced in their districts.

To address the research questions of this study, I observed and interviewed four principal supervisors (two elementary and two secondary) in School System B to

glean how the supervision and support they provided to their assigned principals

aligned to the support recommended by Honig, as well as to the district's leadership

standards for principals.

Section 3-Methods/Procedures

Participants. Four principal supervisor participants were selected

purposefully to represent both elementary and secondary District B principal

supervisors. School System B has two high school, one middle school, one education

campus (K-8) and five elementary principal supervisors. I invited two of the

secondary principal supervisors to participate in the study (one middle school and one

high school). Both were principal supervisors with one year of experience in the role.

Both also had previous experience with the district. The high school supervisor

served as a principal in the district for several years, left the district to work for a

principal preparation program, and returned the year prior to this study. The middle

school principal supervisor had served as both an elementary and high school

principal for several years within the district and had recently been promoted to the

position of principal supervisor. I purposefully decided not to include both of the

district's high school principal supervisors, because there were only two, and the risk

of identifying specific individuals as well as drawing comparisons between their

approaches to supervision was unfair. Two elementary principal supervisors were

also asked to participate in the study. I selected one first year supervisor who was

new (with only one year of experience in the district) and another returning principal

supervisor who was in his third year in the role, after being promoted from a

principalship in the district. Although, in this study, I deliberately sought not to

compare the practice of two elementary principal supervisors explicitly, there are moments where such comparison was unavoidable. However, because there were three times the numbers of elementary principal supervisors, as there were secondary ones, the anonymity of the participants at this level could more easily be preserved.

Data collection. The following sections describe the procedures used to address the research questions.

Observations. I conducted observations so I could observe what supervisory and support-related duties principal supervisors performed when they were at school sites, and to get objective information on how these leaders' allocation of time when visiting schools, aligned with the five key supports identified by Honig and with the district's leadership standards. To gain this information, I shadowed each of the selected principal supervisors during school visits for one full day of their choice in a week they selected. During the observation period, I captured detailed notes on what actions each principal supervisor took while in their respective school buildings. This included capturing detailed notes on the following:

- Classes visited
- Feedback and/or recommendations given to principals before, during, and after classroom visitations
- Meetings observed
- One-on-one conferences with principals
- Interactions with students and staff during the observation period, and
- Other actions taken during the observation period.

*Time logs for principal supervisors***.** To address the research questions of what

school-related, district priorities principal supervisors perceived they were expected

to impact, how principal supervisors allocated their time when outside of schools, and

to what degree this allocation of time aligned with Honig's core practices or the

districts' leadership standards, each principal supervisor was asked to provide details

regarding their activities during one five-day work week. The following information

was requested: the number of schools that were visited during the selected week, the

amount of time spent at schools providing direct support, and the amount of time

spent on other work outside of school (such as in meetings or answering emails). To

glean this information, each supervisor was also asked to share snapshots of their

Outlook Calendar screen with me (with personal events removed). These calendar

screen snapshots included:

- Meetings attended,

- Time allocated to complete paperwork, answer emails or address parent

  concerns, and

- Key projects or tasks completed.

The information collected in these calendar snapshots was used to triangulate

perceptions of how principal supervisors felt they spent their time (i.e., what

percentage was spent on school visits, vs. in meetings, et cetera).

Observation data was collected during the principal supervisor's normally

scheduled school day visits. I shadowed each principal supervisor for each of the

school visits they completed during one full day of service.   This turned out to be two

school visits for each principal supervisor. An iPad III notability application was

used to collect field notes for observation data. Either on the day of the observation or within three business days of each observation, each principal supervisor was asked to submit a screenshot of their Outlook calendar for the five business days before the school visit.

Principal supervisor interviews. I conducted interviews of each of the four principal supervisors either on the same day as the observations or within five business days. Where possible, the scheduling of these interviews was done before the observation. However, in some cases, principal supervisors either chose to do both the interview and the observation on the same day or waited until the day of the observation to determine a date for the interview. In one case, the interview was done via telephone in order to accommodate a principal supervisor's busy schedule. All other interviews were done face-to-face, which was the preferred method.

The purpose of the interview was to gain the principal supervisors' perspectives on all four research questions: what they felt they needed to supervise or support (for individual schools), what school-related district priorities they felt they were expected to impact, how they allocated their time both inside and outside of schools, and the degree to which this time allocation aligned with the leadership standards or Honig's framework. Time was also allocated to ask clarifying questions related to their calendars.   Interviews lasted from 35 minutes to one hour and eight minutes. Interviews were also audio-recorded using the audio-recording feature in the notability application on my password-protected iPad III; then transcribed in Microsoft Word and analyzed after the interviews. Handwritten notes were also collected on the notability application. The middle school principal supervisor's

observation and interview took place in late August (the week before students returned to school). All other observations and interviews took place in early or mid-September.

Interview questions. Open-ended interviews were conducted to both triangulate the information obtained via observations and calendar snapshots and to explore the perceptions of principal supervisors regarding how they are expected to impact the principals and programs for which they are responsible. Gay et al. (2006) noted that "an interview can produce in-depth data not possible with a questionnaire" (p.173) and stated that the format allows interviewers to clarify answers or probe further. The authors cautioned, however that interviewers should use protocols, must communicate effectively and must be meticulous in recording responses. (p. 174).

McNamara (2014) defined standard open-ended interviews as ones in which, "the same open-ended questions are asked to all respondents," and described open-ended questions as those that allow the respondent freely to answer questions without being restricted to "yes, no or numeric" answers. McNamara's site shared specific guidance that adjured researchers to prepare for the interview by choosing the right setting; sharing the purpose of the interview; reviewing confidentiality agreements and contact information; elucidating the interview's format and length; being ready to take meticulous notes, and answering participants' questions. The site also shared advice related to how to conduct the body of the interview. This advice included ideas such as asking questions one at a time; being sure to remain neutral; verbally and physically encouraging responses; maintaining control of the interview, and transitioning properly between topics.

Following are the questions that guided the interviews for this study, and the research questions they helped answer:

1. *(Background)* Please share any information about your background that you feel is a part of your journey to your current position of principal supervisor.

2. *(Background)* What professional development (or experiences) have you received in the course of your educational journey that has prepared you for your role as principal supervisor?

3. *(Background)* What additional professional development do you think would have been beneficial for you, or would be beneficial for new principal supervisors?

4. *(Background)* What educational philosophy or beliefs ground your work?

5. *(Research questions 1, 3 and 4)* Please share how much of your time this week (More than you planned; the right amount; less than you planned; little-to-none) you feel you spent on the following and share what specific supervision or support you had in mind when you gave that answer.

   a. Instruction (This includes setting vision/goals; school/classroom planning; effective classroom instruction; and data-driven instruction)

   b. Talent (This includes identifying /placing talent; evaluating staff members, and retaining staff.)

   c. School Culture (This includes positive environment; high student behavioral and academic expectations; and effective interventions).

d. Operations (This includes efficient operations management; maximizing resource use, and fulfilling legal and policy requirements).

e. Family and Community (This includes building community/family relationships; parent responses, and sharing information with families.)

f. Personal Leadership (This includes self- improvement; effective communication; cultural competence; perseverance.)

6. *(Research questions 1, 3 and 4)* Please share how much of your time this week (More than you planned; the right amount; less than you planned; little-to-none) you feel you spent on the following and share why you gave that answer:

   a. Brokering

   b. Modeling

   c. Providing differentiated assistance

   d. Developing and using tools

   e. Engaging principals as resources for each other.

7. *(Research questions 1-4)* What items are on your "to-do list" now related to your schools, district priorities or to your position? What major tasks/items do you feel you need to tackle in the next three months?

8. (*Perceptions of the role*) What do you enjoy most about your job as a principal supervisor?

9. *(Perceptions of the role)* What, about the position, do you think should be re-examined?

10. *(Research questions 1-4 and perceptions of the role)* What else would you like me to know about expectations or realities tied to the principal supervisor role at the _____ level?

11. (*Research questions 1-4*) This is the information I captured about how your time was allocated during the week of _____. Please correct any inaccuracies.

    a. You spent _____ hours in schools providing direct support to those specific schools or principals (not engaged in general work for other schools or the district).

    b. You spent _____ hours not engaged in face-to-face support for a specific principal or school. During that time, you engaged in the following activities: (list activities from shared log).

    c. What did you mean when you listed _____? (Clarify items in shared log).

    d. Is there any other way you used your time professionally, that is not accounted for here?

Section 4-Data Analysis

Gay et al. (2006) suggested that qualitative researchers should take several steps to analyze data. These include identifying themes, coding data, asking questions about that data, analyzing antecedents and consequences, and sharing what is missing (pp. 471-473). Their method for coding data included photocopying data,

labeling blocks of text, cutting and pasting blocks of text onto index cards, using a numbering system that allows blocks of text to be traced back to original context, grouping cards that have similar labels, and revisiting piles of cards to see if labels still apply (p. 472). However, the authors also noted that computer software could be used to assist with the qualitative analysis process (p.475).

The process used for data analysis in this study took advantage of technological tools such as Microsoft Word and Excel to facilitate the process. Once hand-written and audio-recorded notes were collected during the shadowing of each principal supervisor, they were transcribed into a Microsoft Word document. These discreet notes were time-stamped and manually coded in Microsoft word, using codes specific to each principal supervisor, time, and segment. Interview responses were recorded in Microsoft Word for each question. Once the coded transcripts were completed, and interview transcripts were completed, three excel spreadsheet were created for each principal supervisor. The first spreadsheet contained separate columns for each of District B's Leadership Standards. The second contained columns for each of Honig's best practices. The third contained rows for each of the interview questions and responses. Once each of the spreadsheets was created, discreet and coded pieces of evidence were copied and pasted into the appropriate category in each spreadsheet. Data from each observation was pasted twice—first into the leadership framework spreadsheet, then into the Honig practices spreadsheet. Interview responses were only recorded in the interview spreadsheet.

Recording the data in this manner allowed me to see easily pervasive themes and patterns for each type of data collected. The data was stored electronically.

Because I have served as a principal supervisor in the past, and currently serve as the direct supervisor of some of the participants, I took deliberate steps to attempt to minimize observer bias. First, I conscientiously sought to avoid allowing those biases to color my research. Additionally, I completed member checks once data had been collected and analyzed.

Section 5-Human Subject Review

Principal supervisors' identities and districts were not explicitly mentioned; however, the size, location and reference documents of this school district study may make the subjects identifiable to an audience familiar with the district. This risk was shared with participants in the informed consent letter. Additionally, raw observation notes were shared with participants before analysis. Participants were offered the opportunity to remove any content they perceived to be injurious. Participants were also explicitly informed of the opportunity to opt out of the study at any time and of their right to have none of the information collected regarding them, used in the study.

Because the researcher is a supervisor of the participants, there was the possibility that participants could feel pressured to participate. For that reason, a colleague who was not in a supervisory position, and who was not connected with District B, was asked to send the informed consent form, and acted as a liaison in the case participants decided to opt out of the study.

Section 6-Summary

This study, in its exploration of how the support provided to principals at different levels compares, could benefit principal supervisors as they plan how best to provide assistance. However, outcomes of this study should benefit more those who design support models for principals at elementary and secondary levels, as it seeks to provide information on whether or not there must be level-specific accommodations made to the principal supervisor role in order for all levels to function at maximum levels of effectiveness. Principals receiving optimal levels of support in professional learning will be better positioned to facilitate high levels of student growth and/or achievement.

Chapter 3: Results of the Study

This study sought to answer a number of questions related to the revamped principal supervisor role that was created in a number of large urban school districts to improve principals' instructional leadership and thus, students' academic achievement.   Specifically, this study explored the perceptions of principal supervisors at the elementary and secondary school levels regarding their supervisory and support-related responsibilities for their individual schools; expected impact on school-related district priorities; the amount of time they spent meeting the varied demands of their position; and their ability to allocate desired amounts of time to their core work. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What aspects of the *school programs* do principal supervisors decide to supervise or support at their individual schools and do these differ between elementary and secondary school principal supervisors?

2. What school-related, *district priorities* do principal supervisors perceive they are expected to impact, and do these perceptions differ between elementary and secondary school supervisors?

3. What *proportion of their time* do elementary and secondary school principal supervisors devote to *work inside and outside of schools* and for which purposes?

4. What *proportion of their time* do elementary and secondary school principal supervisors *devote to each Honig's five key supports*, and to supporting principals in developing their skills along the *district's leadership standards*?

To answer these questions, I shadowed (observed) four District B principal supervisors between late August (one week before students returned to school) and mid-September. The principal supervisor shadowing experiences helped me do the following:

- Learn more about each principal supervisor's approach to his/her role,

- Learn about the degree to which his/her site visits met his/her goals for elementary principal support,

- Learn about the degree to which each principal supervisor was able to utilize best practices during his site visits,

- Learn how each principal supervisor's perceptions compared to evidence collected during the site visit, and

- Learn how each elementary principal supervisor's perceptions and the evidence that supported them might later compare to their secondary colleagues' perceptions.

I also interviewed all four principal supervisors. They were asked four sets of questions. These included questions on principal supervisors'

1. Backgrounds, experiences and philosophies,

2. Perceptions of time spent on developing principals' capacity in the district's leadership framework,

3. Perceptions of time spent using each of Honig's strategies, and

4. Perceptions of/recommendations for their role.

Section 1: Descriptions of Principal Supervisors in District B.

    Principal supervisor backgrounds. The first principal supervisor (PS) observed supervised eleven middle schools and one alternative school that served both middle and high school students. This PS had a wide range experience in both public and charter schools, as well as a short stint in Central Office. He had been a teacher, assistant principal, and principal in District B, and had worked in both elementary and secondary schools. He possessed a degree in an educational content area, as well as one in Educational Administration. The eleven comprehensive middle schools he served range in size from 239 to 1,332 with most schools serving approximately 300-500 students. Five of these schools had previously been designated as schools needing the most intense support and having the largest achievement deficits.

    The second principal supervisor observed and interviewed (Elementary Principal Supervisor One or PS1) had extensive prior district experience, having served almost his entire educational career in District B in a variety of positions— including teacher, assistant principal, and acclaimed principal.   Equipped with a bachelor's degree in a content area, as well as two Master's degrees (one in Educational Administration, and the other in Executive Leadership) he supervised fourteen elementary schools that ranged in size from 280-634, with most schools serving approximately 300-450 students.   At the time of this study, he was just beginning his third year serving in this capacity. Six of these schools were designated as needing intense support and as having achievement deficits.

The next principal supervisor studied (Elementary Superintendent Two or PS2) like her colleagues, had experience as a teacher, assistant principal, and principal. She had also served as Curriculum Director for a small school district. However, unlike her elementary counterpart, all of this experience had been obtained outside of District B. At the time of this study, she had one year of experience as a principal supervisor with District B, and was beginning her second year. During this time, she supported twelve elementary schools and one school that served kindergarten through eighth grade. Four of these schools were designated as schools in need of intense support and as having significant achievement deficits.

The final principal supervisor observed and interviewed was the high school PS. Possessing a bachelor's degree in a content area, and a Master's degree in Education Administration, he also had served in several school-based roles. He had been a department chairperson in another school district, as well as an assistant principal and award-winning principal in School System B. Though he left District B to serve as an executive level administrator in an external educational organization, he returned to accept the position of principal supervisor, and as of this study, had been serving in this capacity for just over a year. He supervised twelve diverse high schools. Three of those schools were classified as application high schools, meaning students had to apply to attend and had to meet certain acceptance criteria. Students who failed to make adequate progress could be *uninvited* to these schools (i.e., required to return to their neighborhood schools). These schools tended to have higher achievement levels. One of these schools served students from kindergarten through high school (although only the high school portion had entrance and

application requirements). The high school principal supervisor's portfolio also included three alternative high schools, which were schools designated for struggling students. The last group of school supervised by this principal supervisor was five comprehensive high schools. These were traditional high schools that served wide ranges of students. Six of the schools in this principal supervisor's portfolio were designated as schools in need of intense support and had significant achievement deficits.

As an aside, most of the students attending all of the schools discussed above (regardless of level) were African-American, with a few schools serving significantly more diverse populations that included Latino, White, and Asian students.

Supervision/professional development of principal supervisors. Principal supervisors in District B were supervised by deputy chiefs. There was one deputy chief who supervised the six elementary/education campus principal supervisors and another who supervised the three middle and high school principal supervisors. These deputy chiefs reported to the Chief of Schools, who in turn, reported to the district's top-ranking executive. Deputy Chiefs not only supervised and evaluated principal supervisors but also represented their interests, as well as the interests of the schools they supervised, at the executive level.

Principal supervisors met with each other and with their deputy chiefs once a week for professional development, and to discuss their work. At the time of this study, there were four types of meetings that took place each month. The first meeting was generally spent with all principal supervisors meeting (across levels) to engage in professional learning and to discuss district work that impacted all levels.

The professional learning at this meeting was often centered on pivotal literature in the educational field, and the rest of the time was spent meeting with other central office members whose work intersected with that of the principal supervisors. The second meeting was one in which the principal supervisors shadowed each other, with the goal of offering each other non-evaluative feedback on their practice. These too were not limited to specific levels. The third type of meeting engaged principal supervisors of all levels in explicit professional learning on a topic mutually agreed upon by the principal supervisors and deputy chiefs. At the time of this study, the principal supervisors and deputy chiefs had agreed to focus their professional learning on the concept of *blended coaching* which entailed providing individualized support to principals to help them attain specific goals. The fourth type of meeting was one in which principal supervisors met with only their deputy chief and their level-specific colleagues to discuss work specific to that level.

Section 2-Data Collection Results

Elementary Principal Supervisor One. As mentioned above, Elementary Principal Supervisor One (also referenced as PS1 or PS) was an experienced educator with over 15 years in public education, much of that experience having been obtained in District B. Having served as an elementary teacher of multiple grades, as an elementary assistant Principal, and as an award-winning principal, and with degrees in both content (History) and Leadership (two master's degrees) this educator appeared well-suited for the role of principal supervisor.

***Observation of Elementary Principal One*.** I shadowed PS1 as he completed his school visits for one full day. The portion of his day allocated to school visits was

47

approximately five and a half hours.   He began his day at a school led by a principal who was new to the district but who had served as a principal in another school district. Even before he entered the building, he was greeted warmly by a staff member whom he knew by name. (These personal greetings from staff continued throughout the day, showing that the principal supervisor was well known by staff in his schools).

Once in the principal's conference room, the principal supervisor referenced an email he had sent to the principal prior to the visit, that detailed exactly what they would cover during the visit, and they began to follow that agenda. The agenda included time to discuss individual staff, time to review the efforts of the school's academic leadership team, time to observe classrooms, time to debrief observations of the classroom, and time to discuss enrollment, student attendance, and student satisfaction efforts. The visit was scheduled to last two and a half hours.

The session began with the principal sharing general thoughts about what she was currently focusing on, which was clarifying job roles and responsibilities among her staff.   The PS also reminded the principal that in the email he sent as a follow-up to his last visit, he stated he wanted the principal to focus on attendance, talent management, and student satisfaction.   The conversation moved to various topics: support for various teachers, use of a district-sponsored technology program, the principal's focus areas, etc. The bulk of this time, though, was dedicated to a teacher-by-teacher review of support needed to improve the overall instructional program. For instance, the two discussed that the principal needed to reach out to one of her colleagues to coordinate orientation efforts for two new teachers whom they shared.

They also talked about specific teachers' needs. These needs included student engagement, legal compliance, and classroom structure/environment work for one teacher, family engagement and rapport for another, a need to generate evidence of student learning and a need to maximize the use of instructional time for yet another. They also talked about which teachers had highly effective or effective levels of practice. During the conversation, it became clear that the PS knew each of the teachers and had even had a hand in hiring a few of them. He asked questions such as, "How's Ms. K adjusting to kindergarten…How's Ms. C in third grade?...and made statements such as I know about Teacher ___."

In the latter case, the principal stated, "That's the only teacher I would definitely say is highly effective."

To this, PS1 responded, "Yes, I fought tooth and nail to make sure _____ stayed in this building last year. Every time I visited, I would make a special visit to her…what makes her interesting is she is young and petite…but she holds it down."

The principal supervisor also asked clarifying and probing questions throughout the session that prompted the principal to note action steps for herself or to reflect out loud about something she would like to do differently as a result of the conversation.

One example of this was when the PS asked the principal to reach out to another principal to coordinate support for new teachers. Another was when he recommended that the principal focus specific teachers on movement in students' reading levels: "How many of your babies have been here for Pre-K 3/Pre-K 4, and

then how many of the them are below [proficiency] because if they don't know reading behaviors and print concepts then that definitely is an entry point."

The principal noted, "That's a really good access point…" and mused on the idea that this was a more objective way to help teachers reflect on the effectiveness of their practice. This sort of interaction happened a number of times. In another instance, the PS told the principal that in listening to her it sounded like she wanted to coach a specific burgeoning leader around accountability and follow-through, and asked her, "Have you allocated time for coaching conversations?" The principal responded that this was something she could do more of, wrote a note to herself to add it into her schedule, and affirmed, "I'm glad you brought that up."

Approximately an hour and a half into the visit, we were joined by the school's two assistant principals and commenced observations of four classrooms. The principal supervisor asked the principal what the focus of the observations would be. The principal replied that the walk would focus on alignment of activities with objectives. While waiting for other members of the leadership team to join them, the principal supervisor mentioned that he had assumed all of the hiring functions the year prior, and that he had eliminated a coordinator position, had exchanged another position for a different type, had brought in someone from his previous school, had hired an assistant principal, and had hired a support staff member.

During the classroom visits, the principal supervisor took notes on what he saw. Later, in the principal's conference room, he invited the principal to lead the conversation about what the team saw. The principal led her two assistant principals through a discussion on the use of objectives, the utilization of the teaching aides, the

50

quality of lesson plans, the scheduling of activities within the class, whether the implementation of a reading program aligned with expectations, and whether or not the instruction observed was aligned with national standards.

The principal celebrated that one non-academic teacher had changed his practice as a result of previous feedback. The team clarified next steps for this teacher. Forty minutes into this conversation, the PS shared his perspective not only on the classroom practices he observed but also on the team's debrief. In his comments, he praised the fact that 99% of students were engaged, and that students were ready to learn. He also complimented the team on their correct assessment of the level of implementation of a particular literacy program.

Following his commendations of the team, PS1 asked why a specific teacher was not in their class (students were with an aide), how they planned to provide teachers with feedback, and why some of the pacing in each class was not aligned. He challenged the team to monitor the degree to which whatever feedback given to teachers was implemented and adjured them to "hold teachers accountable" for utilization of feedback. Finally, he reminded the team to dedicate more intense support to some of the upper grades, which although we did not observe them on this day, he knew had behavior concerns. After complimenting the team on its initial success, but reminding them not to rest on their laurels, he ended the visit and moved to his next school.

Approximately 45 minutes later, PS1 and I arrived at his next school, which was led by a principal with over three years of experience at his current school. The agenda for this school visit was the same, but the approach was markedly different.

There was no conference before the classroom observations. Instead, the principal

introduced his own leadership team to the purpose of the day. The principal

explained to his team (which included a program coordinator, an assistant principal

and the school's operations manager, who had previously been a highly effective

teacher) that the purpose of the walk was to look for evidence of student engagement,

which had been a focus for the school. He reminded participants that his focus had

been set by the school's academic leadership team. The principal also asked the team

to be objective and specific; then modeled how to collect evidence in a way that met

his expectations. Finally, he shared that the team would be observing both new and

returning teachers.

After this brief introduction, the group, which included the observer and the

principal supervisor, began classroom observations. During one transition between

classes, while observing the practice of the third-year principal we were observing,

PS1 exuberantly stated, "I believe that choosing the right principals has made all the

difference in my cluster. I love all of my principals."

After visiting four classrooms, the principal supervisor, the principal, the

observer and the leadership team met in a conference room. As was the case in the

previous school visit, the PS first invited the principal to lead the conversation of

what was observed. The principal reminded the team of the focus of their walk

(student engagement) and led the team through a discussion of the engagement levels

in each of the classes they had observed.

During the discussion, the principal sometimes praised members of his team

for specific feedback and in other cases adjured members to focus on the intended

52

purpose of the walk. He also shared his perceptions of student engagement in the

classes they observed and led the team to come up with clear next steps.   For one

teacher, this included needing support with classroom management strategies,

exploring partnering strategies for students, extending wait time, and requiring

students to explain their answers. Regarding another teacher, the group celebrated

that the teacher provided students with multiple ways to engage in the learning and

that she used clear, cooperative learning, but the principal pushed to team to consider

whether the content was grade-level appropriate or adequately rigorous for the grade.

Following this conversation, PS1 shared his feedback on the classroom

observations, the leadership team's approach to instructional calibration, and on the

debriefing process (the process the school used to discuss each teacher and make

recommendations for next steps). PS1's feedback was tailored specifically to the

school. He noted that he saw appropriate visuals in classes and said he was "most

proud of the level of student engagement" (which was the focus area for the

classroom observations). He also praised the use of academic vocabulary. He paused

his praise to note that he had seen a student isolated in one of the classes and to ask

questions about why that was, what type of support the student was receiving, and

how and when the student would be reintegrated into the learning. After the school

responded with the specifics of the student's case, PS1 resumed praising a first-year

teacher for being so patient with a special-needs student and complimented the

leadership team for their interactions with each other, and for generating feedback

about each teacher that was particularly astute. As he did in the last school, PS1

asked the team how feedback would be shared with teachers, what the timing for this

53

feedback was, and how the team would follow up to ensure the feedback was implemented. When the team shared an especially innovative approach to the feedback process, PS1 asked the principal if the entire team could share this with other principals at the next cluster principal's meeting.

The principal supervisor finished by remarking on the exceptional practice he had observed in one teacher's class and asked how that teacher's practice would be shared or "opened up" to the rest of the school. When the principal mentioned using peer observations, the PS suggested that the school might also want to videotape the teacher's practice and use it for professional development. The principal agreed that this was a good idea.

Unlike at the last school, here the PS requested twenty minutes alone with the principal after the team discussion. During this time, he briefly touched on whether the school had experienced any movement in filling its few remaining vacancies, then praised the principal by telling him that everything he observed was fantastic.

At this point, the principal supervisor laughed and said, "I'm going to don my coaching hat." He asked the principal if he was comfortable with participating in a brief coaching session. The principal agreed and the principal supervisor asked,

"How do you think your presence influenced the interaction of the group?"

The principal smiled, "That's actually a question I've been thinking a lot about. The reason I've been thinking about it, is I'm struggling a little bit with some aspects of shared leadership.   I find myself trying to lead the thinking in my direction…I wonder if you observed that." He also mentioned that he was particular

about outcomes and wanted to make sure his school achieved them at the highest levels.

The superintendent complimented the principal on his honesty, "I appreciate your openness and honesty. I really do appreciate it, and I think you have clearly identified an area that we can work on together. We're not going to be able to flesh it out today, but as the year progresses, I would definitely like to sit down and come up with some sort of plan. Observing you work with your team, I think you have a lot of positives. I think you try your best to facilitate conversation…Some of the feedback I'm going to give you—I feel silly, because it's the same feedback I would give myself. But your body language says a lot—in terms of how you felt the visit went. For example when you got to Teacher ____, your disposition changed, and even though there were a lot of things to focus on that were positive, I think your folks started laying into what was wrong with that teacher's practice, based on the physical cues you gave them. Were you aware that occurred?"

The principal responded, "I was not. I was aware that the conversation was leaning more towards growth, but I wasn't aware my body language was contributing to that."

PS1 next asked the principal whether time might have been a constraint and whether or not the principal might have done things differently had he had more time. He gave the principal an opportunity to describe how he might proceed differently in subsequent conversations. He ended this portion of the conversation by commiserating that he (the principal supervisor) too was not always as intentional

55

about his body language as he would like to be, and by reiterating this was something they could work on together.

The principal supervisor summed up his feedback with clear next steps, "One of the things I think you can do immediately is increase your wait time….Help your team develop more confidence in themselves…I would have liked to see more discourse….Your people respect you, and your instructional expertise is phenomenal. I just don't want you to have a team of 'yes' people around you."

The principal expressed in heartfelt tones, that he appreciated the feedback, "I really appreciate the feedback. I really do." At this point, the PS announced that he was taking his coaching hat off, would be back in the next week or two to discuss this more, and that he wanted to use the remaining 11 minutes to discuss some other topics. "What's going on with that fifth-grade teacher that left?" He praised the school's attendance and student satisfaction rates, and then asked the principal to help lead the work on a survey they had used, and that he would like to use with the entire cluster. The PS also queried where the school was in its implementation of a district-wide intervention framework. When the principal supervisor asked about suspensions, and learned the school had none, he inquired how the school accomplished this. The principal explained his use of restorative justice, socio-emotional learning, and in-school suspension, and the PS asked if the principal could document that so it could be shared with the other cluster principals.

When asked if there were any other areas to discuss, the principal mentioned feeling that some of his staff members remained reluctant to give him valuable feedback about their concerns. The principal supervisor mentioned having similar

challenges with getting upward feedback. He modeled being reflective about this and asked the principal for ideas on what he could do differently. The principal offered his assistance in this area for the PS, and the PS offered to come to a faculty meeting to do a temperature check on the mood for the principal and to offer feedback. The principal supervisor closed the visit two hours after it had begun by sharing an article on leadership. This visit was half an hour shorter than the first school visit. After leaving this school, the PS departed for a central office meeting.

Interview of Elementary Principal Supervisor One. PS1's interview responses were strongly supported by what I observed when I shadowed him. During his interview, PS1 indicated that he had found the blended coaching professional development he received very helpful, and I did observe him using coaching techniques at both schools. At one school, he helped the principal decide what to do with staff who were struggling, and at the other school, he helped the principal to reflect on a personal growth area (distributive leadership). The PS said he liked to spend approximately 3 ½ hours in site visits, in order to have adequate time for observing classrooms, observing leadership team meetings, observing teacher meetings if possible, observing the leadership team's discussion of classroom or meeting observation, and then sharing feedback both with the collective team and separately with the principal. He articulated that this amount of time allowed for a discussion of progress toward school and district goals, as well as for discussion of other topics that were lower priority (i.e. enrollment, staffing, operations, etc.). At the visit to the novice principal's school, that is exactly how much of the time was spent.

This principal supervisor shared during the interview that he spent the majority of his school visits focusing on instruction, the most heavily-weighted element of the district's leadership framework (as described in Section I) with little-to-no time spent on other elements of the framework, such as operations or family and community. This was supported by what I observed during the site visits. Most of the time in his visits was focused on observing and discussing the teaching and learning that was happening in the building, with an eye to how to improve that teaching and learning as necessary. During the interview, PS1 espoused the importance of talent management, and it is worth noting that by far the bulk of his time in schools was spent discussing and developing the talent. At least forty-five minutes of each visit was spent observing the talent (staff) and an additional forty-five minutes to over an hour was spent discussing opinions of that how to develop that talent (i.e. what feedback or professional development to provide and when and how to provide it).

Finally, when viewing his work through the lens of the Honig framework, PS1 expressed that he often used the practice of engaging principals as resources for each other and providing differentiated assistance, and this too proved consistent with what was observed. As an example of engagement of principals as resources for each other, PS1 asked both principals to share practices they executed well with their colleagues at an upcoming cluster meeting. In the area of providing differentiated assistance, the support and feedback he provided at each school was specifically and deliberately tailored to the schools visited. For instance, at the first school he visited, when meeting with a principal who was new to the school, the principal supervisor

went through the entire staff roster, discussing the strengths and weaknesses of each teacher's practice. At the second school, he did not do this, limiting the discussions of teachers to only those observed.

As he indicated in his interview, PS1 spent very little time (if any) brokering (i.e., connecting schools with district resources) or modeling (showing them how to do something, rather than telling them); and while he did use or reference tools (such as the informal observation template used at the second school), those used were school-developed.

Related to the district's leadership framework (which included Instruction, Talent, School Culture, Operations, Family/Community and Personal Leadership) in the interview, PS1 declared that he planned to focus solely on instruction and talent (with school culture folded into instructional conversations or reviews) and he did—leaving little time for Operations or Family and Community—not because he did not feel they were important, but because he indicated he had limited time and wanted to prioritize how that time was spent. Just as described, personal leadership was developed through conversations on the other major elements. With respect to Honig's framework, the strategies most utilized by this superintendent were providing *differentiated assistance* (with an emphasis on coaching) and *engaging principals as resources for one another*.

When asked items he felt responsible for in the near future, the first item PS1 (Principal Supervisor One) named was the comprehensive school plan (which is an extensive plan that all District B schools have to write on what specific aspects of their school program they plan to improve in a given year, and what strategies they

59

plan to use to accomplish this improvement). The second item he felt was pressing

was the need to have conversations about evidence for evaluation ratings. The third

item he named was the need to get to academic leadership team meetings for each of

his schools. The fourth item he felt he needed to accomplish was participation in

formal observations at each of his schools, and the last item he felt he needed to

accomplish was observation of grade-level collaborative planning meetings at each of

his schools.

To round out the interview, PS1 was asked how he allocated his time during

the week. A snapshot of his calendar for the week was used to triangulate his

response. Based on his responses, and the review of his calendar, PS1 spent 23.5

hours on school visits—which included spending time in classes, conferencing with

his principals, and observing academic leadership team meetings. He spent 21

additional hours in meetings at the central office (e.g. in a mandatory meeting for all

district central office staff, and in a meeting where all of the elementary

superintendents collaborated to plan an academic leadership team professional

learning session) in superintendent professional development, and at family and

community events, such as back-to-school nights.

Elementary Principal Supervisor Two. Like PS1, Elementary Principal

Supervisor Two (PS2) also taught multiple elementary grades in her tenure as a

National Board Certified Teacher. (National Board Certification is a rigorous process

used to certify teachers who practice at the highest level of the profession). New to

District B, before her arrival this principal supervisor also served as an assistant

principal and principal, and in a departure from her elementary colleague, served as a

curriculum director as well. Similar to her colleague, she held multiple degrees in education (including a Bachelor's degree in Elementary Education, and Master's and Doctorate degrees in Curriculum and Instruction).

Observation of Elementary Principal Supervisor Two. The shadowing of PS2 began at the school of a veteran principal whose instructional program differed from the traditional elementary school program in that it was not restricted by grade bands, and was based on an alternative, but widely recognized, educational philosophy. The principal had led this school for five years, and had previous experience leading several other schools in District B. Like her elementary colleague, PS2 had sent her agenda to the principal in advance, and referenced it in her conversation with the principal. For this visit, PS2's agenda was detailed and contained items such as a review of the comprehensive school plan, discussion of the work of the school's academic leadership team, a review of the school's goals, a review of progress toward a district-led initiative, and time for feedback and support. The agenda even contained guiding questions and explicitly showed the alignment of each item with the system's leadership framework.

After a brief discussion of the above-referenced agenda, the principal supervisor and principal began visiting classrooms. In between visits to each of the four classes that were observed, the principal supervisor paused in the hallway and asked the principal what he had noticed. The principal shared his observations. After one class, for instance, he noted that the students were not really clear about the purpose of a measurement activity and that the case was the same with a fractions activity another group was attempting. He noticed the students were not really clear

about what was expected. While visiting classrooms, PS2 spoke with children--asking targeted questions (e.g. "Can you work together or just by yourself…how do you check your work...?") and listening closely to their responses. During the visits to classrooms, the principal supervisor mentioned the school's test results as an aside and described a need to focus on closing a fifty percentage point achievement gap that had surfaced between African American and White students in one content area.

When the principal supervisor and principal returned to the principal's office, PS2 asked clarifying questions, such as whether the practices observed in one class were normal, how content in another class was organized and whether one class used worksheets exclusively. She also asked how an instructional coach worked with the teachers on their planning. After receiving responses to her questions, she shared her perspective on what she had seen. She expressed her surprise at the abundance of worksheets in all classrooms, mentioning that this was different from what she normally sees.   Stating that what she observed on this day did not seem to align with either the national standards or the school's educational philosophy, she recalled examples of writing assignments from classes visited and stated that she would like to see those types of writing assignments aligned to national standards. She also shared that when she inquired of a student about what normally happens in the class, the student shared that worksheet-based learning observed was usual. She modeled questioning the teacher about the rigor and shared that worksheets are not the best vehicle for rigorous instruction. She also noted the lack of *manipulatives* (hands-on learning tools) in a particular class.

In the course of the conversation, the principal supervisor either highlighted important things for the principal to consider, asked probing questions to help the principal arrive at concrete next steps, or made explicit recommendations of strategies to address some of the school's targeted growth areas.

For instance, the PS reminded the principal of the eminent release of his beginning-of-year assessment data. "I know that this conversation will certainly come alive when you receive your beginning-of-year assessment data. You'll just have to look at the data. These are the standards. This is what our students are expected to know and be able to do. If our instruction doesn't match that, they [the students] aren't going to have a chance…The instructional coach—tell me how she's working with the teachers on their plans?"

The principal responded that the instructional coach is working with primarily elementary teachers, "since that's where our struggles have been." He elaborated, "She meets with the teachers for an hour block, then goes in and reviews their lesson plans. Her focus is going to be to look at the PARCC performance descriptors, and look at what the highest level is asking them to do, and look at whether lesson plans are pushing students toward that level five [highest level]. If not, they've got to go back and plan."

The principal supervisor seized on the last point and drove it home. "I'm thinking that your instructional coach has to back her work up to the plans, because the plans are so far off. They're not planning for rigorous instruction; hence they're planning for worksheet. You're going to miss the mark all the time. It seems like her time would be better spent in helping the teachers with the planning. They need

to focus on aligning their lessons to the district's curriculum and the common core standards. That should be priority number one. What was your process for lesson review and lesson planning?"

The principal responded, "I have not seen her feedback on those yet, but I have seen the debrief notes. That's something I need to start looking at and sitting in on." The principal supervisor agreed, "I would see what you could do to be more closely involved in the lesson planning. I don't think you can delegate all of that to your instructional coach since she is not an administrator. I would assume the teachers would have pushback, so you may need to assist the instructional coach."

The principal supervisor then clarified that the first step was for teachers to see the need for change, but the second was using the resources in the building (including the principal, assistant principal, and coach) to help with planning. She culminated this part of the conversation by articulating that there was much opportunity for growth toward instruction that was aligned with national standards.

Next the PS moved to the talent management portion of her agenda, asking if there were any new teachers. The principal described two new teachers, and his plans to support them. He noted that one teacher was struggling with the alignment of the educational philosophy to the district's units of study and said it was difficult for teachers who came from other programs similarly modeled on the school's chosen educational philosophy—especially private schools. The principal shared his attempt to grow the school's instructional practice so that the school moved from solely focusing on structures aligned with the school's original model, to instruction that was aligned with the national standards.

The PS finished this branch of the conversation by affirming that overall this school was "a happy place." She followed this by shifting to the remaining items on her agenda. In a discussion of the school's comprehensive school plan, the principal supervisor asked for the school's three focus areas. When the principal shared them, the PS inquired how the school chose one of the areas. After listening to the principal's response, the PS clarified that focus areas should be based on challenge areas and that one of the areas chosen was actually one of the school's strengths. She reminded the principal to focus on a challenge area that would help the school overcome deficits in its student achievement.

She then asked about the school's academic leadership team. During the discussion of what the team was focused on, PS2 recommended that the school use the resources from a recent training to guide the team's work. After this, the principal supervisor asked the principal to begin drafting his evaluation goals. This had been one of the topics touched on at the previous day's principal's meeting. The principal shared that he had already drafted his goals and asked PS2 to provide feedback. He discussed specific reasons for choosing one of his goals. PS2 responded that she was comfortable with the student satisfaction goal. She also noted that the principal had three goals in one instructional area and only one in another and suggested that since the other area was the school's target area, he should increase goals in that area by one (This was the area of the achievement gap) and decrease the goals in the other area by one. She also recommended that one of the goals be measured in a different way.

After checking to see if the school would be participating in an upcoming professional development session, the principal supervisor asked the principal to reflect on the visit, "What are your priorities based on our discussion today?" The principal responded that his priorities were planning—determining alignment to the district's scope and sequence, giving feedback on lesson plans, and observing lessons. He expressed wanting to be very intentional and procedural.

The PS ended the visit asking what supports were needed, to which the principal responded that he first wanted to talk with another principal whose school used the same educational philosophy as his and who executed the practices he was interested in very well. PS2 agreed that the other principal was a good resource and mentioned that the students in that school showed exceptional levels of success.

Approximately two hours after her arrival, the principal supervisor left this school and moved on to her next. It was late in the school day, and PS2 had not had an opportunity to stop for lunch, so she had a working lunch in the office of the next principal, another veteran within the school system, who was in her third year as principal of this school. At this school, the visit was markedly different. The principal supervisor asked a broad question regarding the principal's approach ("What are you focusing on?"), and the principal led the conversation from this point forward. She shared progress in a number of areas: increasing enrollment, adding another grade level to her school, the after-school program, food bank distribution, construction of an outdoor classroom, and beginning-of-year testing. The principal supervisor asked if there were any testing glitches and queried about the school's decision to move away from the district's coaching program to school-based resource

66

teacher support. The principal described why the change was made and provided

detailed information about the supports the new team was providing (math

conferencing, weekly agendas, literature discussions, pushing into classes, coaching

teachers, delivering small group instruction, daily exit tickets, administering and

analyzing pre-assessments, etc.). The principal expressed pride in her team. When

PS2 asked how teachers had responded to the support, the principal answered that

they loved it. The principal chuckled that the new math support teacher provided one

teacher with three pages of feedback, laughed that she loved the teacher's aggressive

initial approach and shared that she planned to talk to her. She shared how she

regularly met with collaborative teams whom each brought short cycle assessment

results. She also provided artifacts that showed the schedule that the resource

teachers followed (which was an aggressive plan for targeted feedback for various

teachers in 30-minute intervals). The principal described moving away from using

the district's instructional coaches in reading as well, toward school-based teacher

leaders.

Here, PS2 interjected that the school was departmentalized kindergarten

through 6th grade. The principal clarified that they were departmentalized and ability

grouped. She explained that she realized that if teachers were trying to address the

needs of 26 different types of readers they were not addressing any type of reader

particularly well. She recounted experiences she had as an administrator in another

school within the district and how successful this innovative approach turned out to

be. PS2 murmured support for the innovative approach. The principal recounted how

she brought this strategy to her current school and held teachers firmly accountable

for aligning with the school's chosen instructional approaches. The principal supervisor articulated that everyone in the school was accountable. "There is nowhere to hide." When the principal began to share more information about how data was used within the school, the PS chuckled that she wanted to get into classrooms.

The principal, her resident principal, the observer and the principal supervisor visited four classes, where PS2 pointed out various instructional practices that were aligned with district expectations, and remarked on the cohesiveness of the instructional program. After the classroom visits, the principal supervisor and principal reflected together on what to expect on the upcoming assessment results and the principal supervisor encouraged the principal to continue her efforts. This one hour and forty-five-minute visit was fifteen minutes shorter than the previous school visit.

Interview of Principal Supervisor Two. Regarding the alignment of PS2's focus areas with the district's leadership framework--as was the case with PS1, in her interview PS2 indicated that instruction was her priority, and her school visits showed evidence of that. She spent most of her school visits observing classes, discussing what teaching and learning practices she had seen or coaching principals in instructional leadership.

PS2 indicated that she spent more time than she expected on talent, but this was not apparent in the school visits—primarily because PS2 mentioned that most of her talent management work (staffing schools) was done in the summer or in her evaluation of principals, and these things would not be readily observable during a school visit. PS2 communicated that she spent little to no time on Operations (non-

68

instructional management) or Family/Community, and this was definitely the case during her school visits. She asked no operations-related questions at school one and asked only two questions about operations at the second school—one about testing, and the other about the school's new playground. She also shared that she spent less time than desired on personal leadership. This conclusion could be supported by the first school visit observed, where the agenda was packed, and every minute of time was fully utilized, but little time was spent allowing the principal to reflect explicitly on leadership skills of his own selection. At the second school, the principal and her supervisor did not discuss growth areas in personal leadership at all.

As it related to the strategies from Honig's framework that PS2 used in her approach, in the interview, PS2 shared that she spent the majority of her time differentiating assistance. This too was borne out by what was observed in the differences between her two visits. One visit was much more structured than the other, with the PS giving explicit recommendations pointed at helping the school move its performance in two specific areas—aligning instruction to national standards, and closing an achievement gap in one school. In the other school visited, the PS gave no explicit recommendations. This difference appeared to be based on the needs and progress of each school.

Also in her interview, PS2 said she spent less time than desired on modeling and engaging other principals as resources, but in the school visits, she did refer one principal to another, and she did model a conversation with a teacher for the first principal. The idea here was that PS2 used these strategies, but not as much as desired. Alongside this, PS2 mentioned spending the right amount of time on the

strategy of developing and using tools, and this was evident in the first visit, where she spent time guiding the principal through his approach to the comprehensive school plan, and conversing with him about an informal observation tool the school was using. However, in the second school there was no discussion of tools because the school had many that they had developed and were using without her direction (i.e. data analysis templates, and coaching schedules).

When asked what tasks she felt she needed to accomplish in the near future, PS2, like her elementary colleague, listed reviewing the comprehensive school plans and giving feedback. However, she also mentioned needing to review and provide feedback on schools' plans of action related to an instructional intervention initiative, and needing to review principal, assistant principal, and teacher goals to ensure alignment.

In response to questions on how her time was spent during her work week, PS2 shared that in the previous week she had spent twenty hours a week on school visits, fourteen hours in superintendent professional development or in meetings at central office, and three hours at home responding to emails, and writing bulletins for her staff. This was an unusual allotment of time for this principal supervisor as she had been forced to leave work early during the week due to a medical condition.

The middle school principal supervisor. The middle school principal supervisor had a wide variety of educational experience. After serving as a social studies teacher and director in a private school in the same city as District B, he served as a high-level administrator with an educational support services organization as well as with District B, and then went on to serve as both an assistant principal and

a principal in District B schools. He held degrees in both Social Studies (BS) and School Administration (Master's) which helped equip him to work as a principal, not only in District B public schools but charter schools within the district as well. He also had the unique experience of having worked in both high schools and elementary schools.

Observing the middle school principal supervisor (PS). The middle school principal supervisor began his day observing the professional development offered at the school of a veteran middle school principal who had led the school we visited for over four years. It is important to note here, that unlike the other shadowing experiences described previously, which all took place during the school year, this session took place toward the end of the summer because this principal supervisor was being promoted. This meant that there were no classes to observe. Still, the middle school PS had a focus for this visit; he mentioned that in all of his schools, including this one, he was specifically looking for how the school used data, how the school built culture, and what the principal's keynote message was. As the school's assistant principals and teacher leaders led the staff through a review of the school's data (which showed that the school had met or exceeded almost all of its goals in reading, writing, math and truancy) the PS electronically recorded his observations.

During a break, the middle school principal supervisor was enthusiastically greeted by many staff members, all of whose names he knew. He was able to point out a staff member who had transferred from another of his schools and talked with each of the staff members who stopped him about personal or professional things

71

relevant to them: a teaching schedule, baseball paraphernalia, the student support center, etc.

After the break, when the principal delivered her portion of the professional development session in which she described the school's initiatives in school climate and culture, socio-emotional learning, attendance, scheduling, discipline, grades, and academics, he complimented the dedication the school showed to implementing initiatives with fidelity. During her presentation, the principal articulated her personal goal to "stay at the 30,000-foot level." She then walked the faculty through several slides. Each slide had two sections: past and present, and on each slide the "present" section had between one and six bullets. On the first slide (socio-emotional learning) for instance, the principal talked through the school's past efforts (related to developmental design), a conferencing protocol, and two socio-emotional learning programs. In the future section (same slide), she talked staff through seven different initiatives the school would be implementing in this area. The principal also talked the staff through research that grounded the school's efforts and discussed how the school's efforts had evolved over time.

The principal supervisor again expressed that he was impressed with all the school was doing to meet the needs of students and the fidelity with which the school was implementing each component, but noted that he intended to talk with the principal about the degree to which her presentation aligned with her expressed goal of staying at the 30,000 foot level. When the session ended, he asked the principal if he could meet with her briefly in her office.

During the ensuing conversation, the principal supervisor complimented the principal on her school's high fidelity on proven initiatives, and on the results this had produced for the school. The PS also celebrated the principal's clear agenda, high level of preparation and positive feedback to her staff. He shared that there were no huge concerns and that he wanted to collaborate on next steps. He followed this by questioning the principal to provoke reflection. His first question was broad, "How do you think it all went?" The principal shared her thoughts on various components of the day: the turn-and-talk opportunities, the icebreaker, a video, her data slides, et cetera.

The Middle School PS next launched into more probing questions such as, "If you were to step back from the hour-and-a-half of your presentation and step back from the individual pieces of culture, attendance, and other initiatives, what did you want teachers to take away from your presentation?" The principal responded thoughtfully. "Really, from my presentation I wanted them to take that pleasure reading is hugely important to build vocabulary, to build comprehension, to build background knowledge, that it's an easy way to do it, and that is going to be our new focus for the year…that we did really well on the three things we focused on last year, writing, the complex reads, and the blended learning. I wanted them to come away feeling good about themselves. We've got great data, and we're going to tweak these three because you know what…you got it!" She questioned the PS. "Did you get that takeaway?"

To this, the PS answered, "Yes and No—It was definitely in there. I think about the 30,000-foot level…you said you wanted to stay there. I think differently of 30,000 feet. What do you mean when you say 30,000 feet?"

The principal clarified, "When I say 30,000 feet it means we're not going to get into the logistics. We're not going to get into the nitty-gritty, but here's where we were, here's how we got to last year, we showed the great data, and here's how we're going to tweak each thing. I gave them one or two tweaks, and then I dove into the why about the reading. That's what I hoped. You can't motivate people by talking."

The PS reacted to this. "I agree. For me 30,000 feet--you're not getting into logistics, you're not getting into nitty gritty. 30,000 feet to me is probably less than what you presented today. So again, I thought it was a strong presentation. I don't want to…Your faculty is moving forward. I think what we could think about is—if you had a half-hour instead of an hour and a half, what would 30,000 feet look like? To me, it would be high-level messages like--you quoted the national standards, critical reading, and argumentative writing. It's crucial for a democratic society. To me, that's the 30,000 feet level. And then maybe we say, 'As a result of that, here are some of the initiatives.' You could continue your message of 'good to great—we're going to keep pushing forward.' Whichever approach or path you take--when your teachers run up to their rooms after your presentation, what do you want them to do as a result of what they just heard?"

The principal answered, "I have some strong veteran teachers—really good. I would want to not get as much push-back since I did try to hit the why. I was watching their faces. They were getting this pleasure reading."

The PS clarified, "So you want them to have the why…that's legitimate. So when we walk into the hall, if we ask veteran or new teachers how they feel about the initiatives, we want them to say, 'It's a lot, but we do it because…' How do we know if they can do that? How would you and the admin know if they can do that?"

The principal says, "I hope at lunch today, they'll tell me. We're close enough…it's going to be anecdotal."

The PS pushed, "Are you comfortable with anecdotal?" The principal mused out loud on whether or not she was comfortable. The PS summarized, "I could go on and on for about ten minutes on the things that were really effective today. I was at another school's administrative retreat, and to their credit they compared their data with other schools, and I said your school was at the top for reading and math, and I was wearing one of your tee-shirts. I told them to look at the back of your shirt. It says, 'Just do the program and do it with fidelity.' This is the kick-off that creates that culture—the literature, the data, the distributive leadership—I could go on and on. To be clear, there are only two things I want to push you on."

The principal encouraged the PS. "Good. Yes."

The PS continued. "One is get to the 60,000 feet level. Get to that point where you can have that high-level message, and you can say, 'And you can ask _____ for more detail about this or _____ about that.' And that to me goes hand in hand with—I want to push you past the anecdotal feedback. So imagine if the phone survey you did earlier, if you had three questions about pleasure reading, and three questions about what the key message of the day was…."

The principal exclaimed, "Like an exit ticket! You're right!

The principal showed remarkable receptivity to this feedback and mused on what she could do differently almost immediately.   The PS ended this conversation by complimenting the leadership of the principal and how she had built the leadership of her staff. He also complimented her on modeling high-quality instruction, and commended what he saw as a "great start to the year." When the principal mentioned that she wanted to norm her evaluations with those done by other district personnel, the PS volunteered to broker a norming visit with those district personnel. The two-hour visit ended two and a half hours after it had started.

The second school visited during the same day was that of a novice principal who had just been promoted to principal from being a District B assistant principal. As was the case in the first visit, the middle school principal supervisor knew the names of staff, who gleefully greeted him upon his arrival. The PS took notes while the principal concluded the all-day professional development session he and his leadership team had facilitated. When the principal moved to the next part of the day, which was an academic leadership team meeting, the PS remained to observe and take notes. Topics planned for the meeting included testing scheduling, norm-setting, a review of a new instructional observation tool, and a discussion of an article on the work of academic leadership teams.

The principal began the meeting by facilitating consensus around group norms.   He then shared data regarding testing participation rates and led the group through a discussion of which testing option to use to increase participation rates. The conversation lasted 25 minutes, during which various team members expressed their thoughts for and against each option. One team member asked if a third option

could be considered and the principal allowed the team to discuss what a third option could be. As the meeting unfolded, the PS mused that he would have liked to see more time spent on the instructional observation tool, since he suspected the team could benefit from that discussion, and since he thought of the observation document as a high-leverage tool. He made a note to discuss this with the principal. From time-to-time in the meeting, the principal invited the PS to provide feedback to the team on specific issues, such as which testing schedule the school should use. When this happened, the PS was careful only to give advice (i.e. "Whatever you decide to do, make sure you consider the options through the lens of the teachers, testing coordinators and students") rather than to give explicit directions.

Later during the same meeting, the principal disseminated an article on the work of academic (instructional) leadership teams. After reading it silently, all members were asked to brainstorm expectations and non-expectations for the work of their team in connection with the article. Examples of expectations included reflection, sharing a vision, professional learning focus, alignment, use of cultural norms, and development of emerging leaders, providing opportunities to look at student data, and providing clear communications. The conversation closed with the group wondering if all team members were ready to coach teachers instructionally, and whether or not the staff was ready to accept coaching. During the last portion of the meeting, the principal disseminated an observation tool with connected materials and asked the team for feedback. He went around the room to solicit feedback. When it was his turn, the principal supervisor asked how the tool aligned with national standards (a goal the principal had expressed).

After the meeting, while the principal met with his assistant principals to debrief the day, the PS walked the room to read posted staff reflections on the professional development session. Once the administrative meeting concluded, the principal asked the principal supervisor if there was any feedback. The PS complimented the principal on soliciting feedback from his staff and on helping teachers to recognize areas of needed growth. He also shared that he liked the academic leadership team structure—it was concise, crisp and the principal got through a lot. He praised that all team members participated in some elements of the meeting. He also offered accolades on the content of the entire professional development day.

The PS next asked the principal how he felt about the day, to which the principal responded he would like more time to think, but that it went pretty well. The PS went on to ask the principal about the roles and positions of specific staff. He asked the principal why he invited the conversation about the testing options. The principal shared that he wanted to allow the staff to make a choice. The PS further queried why the principal chose to devote that amount of time to a fairly technical topic vs. the more adaptive topics of the observation tool or the academic leadership time discussion. The principal admitted it was an easier way to meet his goal of getting people to participate in a discussion as a team. When the PS challenged the principal, "You don't do easy" the principal further explained that he was more adamant that the instructional tool happen as written. The PS agreed with the principal that it was important to allow the team to "debate something" and to have

their voices heard. He agreed that shared understanding was a good goal and complimented an assistant principal's facilitation of a portion of the meeting.

The PS then modeled a way to limit the discussion of the testing options to give more time/depth to the discussion of the observation tool. He coached the principal that he would prefer to see the academic leadership team (ALT) spend more time on adaptive areas more deeply connected to instructional leadership and instructional conversations. When the principal reiterated that he wanted to make sure there was limited debate on the observation tool, the principal supervisor clarified that he would like to see loosened (but structured) parameters on the instructional stuff and tighter parameters on "the technical stuff." He complimented the principal again on inviting so many team members to the table and for quieting his own voice so that the voices of other team members could be heard. The PS then asked the principal for his *take-away's*. The principal shared the following:

1. Move them (the ALT) to conversations about instruction and keep them there.
2. Make certain to focus on the adaptive (related to instruction) rather than the technical.
3. Set parameters on technical and loosen parameters on instructional.

The PS clarified that it was still good to have parameters on instruction.

He then closed the visit by reiterating that there was a "long list of really good things that the principal should keep doing." He mentioned that he would be sharing the professional development evaluation strategies this principal used with his staff with another principal. The visit ended two hours after it had begun. This site visit

was approximately half an hour shorter than the previous one—possibly because it lasted well past the end of the duty day.

Interview of the Middle School Superintendent. In his interview, the middle school PS echoed the thoughts of his elementary school colleagues on his work in the leadership framework, concluding that he was spending the right amount of time on instruction. This perception was supported by the work observed in his site visit. Even though this visit took place during the summer, the professional development sessions observed all had instruction as a primary focus. Additionally, all of the coaching the PS provided in the second site visit centered on how to use the instructional tool to best improve teaching and learning in the school.   Like his elementary counterparts, the middle school PS responded that he spent little-to-no time on operations or family and community.

Interestingly, when asked about the time he devoted to instruction, the middle school instructional PS counted central office meetings that were centered around instruction (such as a planning meeting for how best to support academic leadership teams) as evidence of his focus on instruction. Neither of the elementary colleagues mentioned this idea though that does not mean they felt otherwise. The middle school PS also felt that he was spending the right amount of time on talent. His observation showed this, in that many of the staff members (talent) knew him and in that he spent a considerable amount of time discussing with principals how to ensure professional development opportunities or instructional meetings helped to build optimal effectiveness of these staff members.

There were other departures of the middle school principal supervisor from his elementary colleagues when it came to what support he chose to provide. For instance, neither of the elementary principal supervisors planned to spend significant time on school culture; however, the middle school PS responded that he spent a solid amount of time supporting the development of school culture plans. Still, he felt this amount of time was less than he planned or wanted. This claim was supported by the site visits observed, as the superintendent took notes on school culture at each of the schools he visited. He also mentioned during the interview that he had spent more time than usual on personal leadership in the previous week, as he had engaged in very targeted leadership conversations with two principals as well as with other administrators within various buildings. Neither of the elementary principal supervisors specifically focused on personal leadership. Again, this was borne out by the site visit, as the middle school PS was very intentional about carving out time for principal reflection and coaching at both of the sites he visited.

When asked to view his support strategies through the lens of the Honig framework, the middle school PS agreed with one of his elementary colleagues that he spent the right amount of time on brokering (connecting principals with central office support) but was the only one to mention instructional brokering. He supported this idea by talking about inviting instructional central office personnel to his cluster meetings so principals would know whom to contact with instructional questions or concerns that fell outside of his realm. During the site visit, there was evidence of brokering when the PS promised to connect the principal with some central office personnel so they could norm perceptions of teacher practice.

The middle school principal supervisor's thoughts about the time spent on modeling (less than he should have), offering differentiated assistance (the right amount) and engaging principals as resources for each other (less than he planned) were all aligned with at least one of the elementary superintendent's responses, but he was the only one to say he spent less time than he had planned on developing and using tools. The site visit showed that the middle school principals supervisor did some modeling (e.g. when he modeled for the second principal how to curtail the operations portion of the ALT meeting to allow for a stronger focus on instruction, or when he modeled for the first principal how to condense her presentation) but the strategy he used most was that of providing differentiated assistance in the form of coaching.

His observation showed that there were some differences between the strategies used by the middle school PS and his elementary counterparts, but these differences were not major enough to point to any marked conclusions. The one hint that different strategies may be required for middle school principal supervisors was the middle school principal supervisor's thought that he wished he had more time to spend on developing and using tools.

When asked what tasks he felt he needed to accomplish in the immediate future, the middle school principal supervisor articulated the need to write monthly feedback documents for all of his principals, give feedback on opening week professional development, plan an upcoming cluster meeting, create tools that his schools could use to monitor progress toward cluster goals, and give each of his

schools feedback on their school culture plans and their instructional intervention plans.

The middle school principal supervisor's responses to questions on how he allocated his time, and his calendar snapshot's review, revealed that he spent 20-21 hours on school visits, and 15 hours in meetings (including an all-day cluster meeting) and professional development. He spent 15 additional hours responding to emails, planning meetings with principals, and working on administrative matters after hours.

The high school principal supervisor. The high school principal supervisor (PS) was the last of the superintendents to be observed. He had recently returned to the district after a hiatus during which he worked in an executive leadership position for an educational agency. Before his service as a principal supervisor for District B, he served in a number of educational roles that provided him with escalating responsibilities: social studies teacher, department chairperson, assistant principal, and principal. He felt these experiences, along with his degrees in social studies (Bachelor's), and education administration (Master's) helped prepare him for his role as a principal supervisor.

Observation of the high school Principal Supervisor. The high school principal supervisor (PS) began his day at a high school led by a veteran principal who had served District B in various schools for over 15 years. He had served as principal of this school for three years. After a brief discussion of a recent non-instructional issue, the principal supervisor began his official visit. To prepare for the visit, he had sent the principal an agenda, the protocol they would be following, and

several new observation tools they would be using during the visit. The agenda included three to five minutes for an overview of the visit by the principal supervisor, five minutes for a principal overview, one hour for instructional walks, 45 minutes for a coaching conversation and five to ten minutes to discuss next steps. The outcomes of the instructional walk visit, which were listed on the agenda, were:

- To norm instructional expectations around [Understanding by Design] planning and common core instructional practices;

- To evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher in developing rigorous plans to support [common core] indicators;

- To evaluate teacher practice in facilitating learning as it relates to common core instructional practices; and

- To evaluate student products/evidence to determine if practice is leading to student outcomes.

All four of the school's assistant principals participated alongside the principal in this visit. The principal supervisor first launched into an extensive explanation of how the team would be using the numerous instructional tools he had sent. These included an informal observation sheet that was aligned to national standards, a categorized note-taking sheet, a document that explained his expectations for the instructional planning he expected to see evidence of during the visit, and a document that explained the protocol the group would use to debrief the classroom visits. After the discussion of these tools, which the high school PS timed to ensure maximum efficiency, the PS asked the principal to describe what the team could expect to see during the instructional walk.

The principal explained that the administrative team had met with the staff last year and had told them the school was moving to use of the instructional planning process the PS advocated. The team had also clarified what was expected. Department chairs and teacher leaders had received professional development. Training on the planning process was offered during planning periods. The team had been meeting to decide how to roll out the planning protocol and had decided to focus initially on objectives and essential questions. Teachers were expected to be proficient in writing and posting clear objectives and essential questions by this point. An assistant principal further extended that teacher leaders and department chairpersons were working with instructional coaches to assist in this effort. Another assistant principal mentioned that a contractor from the state education agency would also be assisting the school in their planning efforts. He stated they had met with this team to cement that assistance and to request professional development and resources.

The PS asked team members to share how they felt about their own level of understanding of the planning process and the national standards. The team members shared honest feedback on their levels of understanding, which ranged from low to high levels of comfort. The principal opened this dialogue by modeling honest reflection. He articulated that he was used to a more directive mode of leadership, but that the planning process was much harder to explain to teachers. He mused that it was taking more time to implement this new process because it was so complex. An assistant principal volunteered that she had been having her team submit lesson plans to her so she could analyze them and provide feedback. The team asked for

professional learning that would better equip them to evaluate what they were seeing and give correct feedback.

The principal continued that he wanted to see a model school that had fully implemented the new planning process and the national standards, because even some celebrated schools did not appear to be fully utilizing these practices. The PS pushed the team to think about how much students were driving the instruction in classes. The principal admitted that he had not bought into a previous initiative led by the high school PS, but said the school did it anyway, and that they saw the positive outcomes yielded by that initiative. He stressed that in the same way, he would need to see the outcomes of the new planning process and national standards in order to "buy in" totally. The PS clarified that the planning process was really about teachers planning so that students would deeply understand content, rather than just memorizing or hearing it. He then concluded the conversation and asked the team to look through the documents. He requested to see an English and a math class.

The group, which included the high school PS, assistant principals, principals and the observer, visited two classes. During each visit, the PS circulated the classroom listening to the teachers and students, taking notes on the instruction and asking students targeted questions. After the visit to the first class, which was the English class, the team returned to the principal's office, where the PS led an in-depth conversation of what was observed, using the provided observation tools as frames and the following debriefing protocol:

I.   Discussion and Debrief <u>(20 minutes)</u>

A. Review the [Understanding by Design] unit and lesson plan to determine alignment to scope and sequence (2 minutes)

B. Principal /[Assistant Principals] and [Principal Supervisor] check [Common Core] indicators in each classroom and assess teacher practice: what did we see? (5 minutes)

C. Evaluate Effectiveness: Review notes. Each person on the team has 1 minute to review findings about common core indicators. What was effective in planning, execution, and student learning? Notes, Evidence, Artifacts

   1. What did teachers do and student do?

   2. What evidence do we have that the practice was effective? What evidence did we collect/record?

   3. Where should we focus next steps?

D. Where do we agree/where do we need further norming? (5 minutes)

I.   Next Steps. (2 minutes)

The PS began the debriefing session by asking the team for evidence that the teacher used the district's scope and sequence. He challenged them to log into the district's curricular platform to determine alignment. The PS mentioned that the teacher answered all of the questions she asked. The principal noted that the teacher attempted to differentiate and that this is what he asked teachers to do. He also affirmed that the teacher quickly answered her own questions and mentioned that

there were many objectives and that were not clearly aligned with each other or with the district's scope and sequence.

An assistant principal noted that when examining the instruction through a national standards lens, students were reading and asked to find evidence, but not writing—just copying. Another said she was happy to see small group instruction, but did not see students persevering with challenging tasks in those groups. She also noted that the questions posed by the teacher in her small group rotation did not help students to a deeper understanding of the text—just a cursory one. She noted the teacher also did not refer students back to the text. After this portion of the discussion had concluded, the PS moved the team to brainstorming what the teacher needed to improve regarding planning and pedagogy. He also challenged the team to determine who would support this teacher so that when he returned he would see that person's "footprints." One assistant principal answered that someone would need to sit with the teacher and plan her lessons with her, requiring her to "stay focused on the essential questions."

Throughout the discussion, the PS asked questions that required the administrative team to show evidence of what the students knew or were able to do. He modeled what the teacher could have done to use the stations effectively. He shared his own observations and the evidence he collected. He modeled how he collected objective evidence. He again modeled tasks the teacher could have planned to produce a different outcome. Watching him, an assistant principal murmured that the students did not have to struggle at all. The PS once again modeled how the teacher could have planned differently to bring students back to the essential

question. He told the assistant principal, "You've got to work with her on her questions. Help her ask good questions that directly point students back to the essential question and objective."

The PS extended on this portion of the visit by reminding the team of all of the good things he observed in the class—classroom management, good rapport with students, a unit board, the right objective, good essential questions. He pushed the team to make sure students were doing the cognitive lift and to focus on design and implementation of performance tasks aligned to the essential question. He asked probing questions, "What should she have done?"

Some team members attempted to answer, "To write."

The PS challenged, "Write what…go back to your objective, what were they supposed to be able to do?"

Team members murmured, "Analyze the text…"

The PS pushed, "So what's a good performance task…a perfect performance task where students will demonstrate that they are able to do that?"

 An assistant principal answered, "They could be asked to write their own piece using the narrative elements to build tension."

The PS affirmed, "Exactly…" He continued that students could be asked to present their work and that other students could evaluate these presentations using some rubric.

Finally, the high school principal supervisor questioned the team about what their next steps with this teacher were. Team members responded that they would focus on questioning techniques and performance tasks. The PS presented a timeline

of a month for this work to occur, then prepared the team for their second

observation--a math class. Participants were asked to print out the math practices he

had sent them in advance, as these were what he wanted them to look for in classes.

At the conclusion of the second classroom visit, the PS requested that the principal

lead the debriefing on what was observed. During this time, the PS remained quiet

and took notes on his laptop.

After the team had finished the principal-led conversation, the principal

supervisor shared his perspective on what he had observed and gave suggestions and

positive feedback. He started by telling the team some good things he had seen—

passionate instructors, administrators asking questions and talking to students in the

classroom, administrators asking about objectives and recording essential questions,

administrators comparing the instruction to common core standards, and

administrators diagnosing what was missed.

He cautioned the team to ground their claims with objective evidence and

modeled this. "Be very careful about making judgment statements, such as students

didn't do this, or that. Always back it up with, 'this is what I heard students say.

This is what they said they could do.' Basically, I'll give an example. I asked three

students today what construction was, and none of them could define it for me. I

asked three students why they were graphing it this way. One student said, 'Well

we're trying to learn angles.' One student said, 'We're trying to build this

construction at the end of the lesson,' and one student said, 'We're trying to make

sense of angles.' I didn't see that in his objective; I don't know if that's what he was

trying to do, but if he was, kids weren't sure exactly what he was doing and why. Use the evidence specifically there."

He also challenged the team to always discuss the performance task. "Be careful about not talking about the performance task, because the way this lesson changes very quickly is if he defines what kids are going to have to understand, and designs a performance task at the end of the lesson, and says they're going to have to do this, and then checks off they're going to have to be able to reason abstractly, they're going to have to… He could literally create an activity where he says, this is a student's construction of this angle. I want you to critique…this is national standard number three right…the reasoning of the student. Then he's hit the [national] standard, and he's planned for them to get there. The PS then modeled asking the teacher probing questions. "Who was doing all of the work?"

Two administrative team members replied, "The teacher."

The PS followed with, "That's how you approach it. You're doing all of the work. He could have had a kid go up to the board, and say, 'Knowing what we know about angles, I want you to do this,' and show the other students how to do it. Because he had no idea if the students could do it. One student actually said, 'My point is pointing in the wrong direction.' He could have said, 'Why? Come up here and show up what you were doing..'"

Next, the principal supervisor told the team that he wanted to see continued conversations about alignment of objectives and performance tasks to national standards. He finished by asking the team to stay focused on evidence.

As the session wound down, the principal asked where the school was on the continuum of adopting the new planning process. He added that the visit had been good for him because it had showed the administrative team that they needed to analyze instruction more deeply. He explained that the team had hitherto been looking for instructional compliance, but that they had not been digging this deeply. Other team members asked clarifying questions, which the PS answered quickly. He followed by advising the school on how they could hold teachers accountable for planning. Following this, he asked the team to provide him with feedback on the structure of the visit, and on the tools and protocols used. Participants articulated that they found the protocol and tools very helpful in norming their perspectives. The team gave concrete feedback on all items, and the PS answered questions posed by them. The site visit concluded after two hours.

Forty-five minutes later and almost immediately after arriving at his second school, the PS briefly introduced the order of the day and the documents he would be using. Soon after this introduction, the PS, the principal (who had previous experience as a principal in another school district, and had led this school for four years) the observer, and the school's resident principal (principal intern) began an instructional walk. During the observation, the PS moved about the class, observing, talking with students and taking notes. After the observation, the team retired to the resident principal's office. There the PS led a conversation about what was observed. As was the case in the first school visit, each participant was invited to share their perceptions on how the instruction observed aligned with the given observation and planning tools, then the superintendent shared his. Through the principal supervisor's

probing questions, the principal arrived at next steps she planned to use to impact the instruction she observed.

The team visited a different content classroom and repeated the same process; although, in the latter instance, the principal supervisor attempted to spur the principal to lead the discussion. However, as the discussion continued, the principal expressed growing frustration with the unfamiliar protocol and the PS resumed facilitation of the discussion. Once again, the high school PS asked probing questions based on the informal observations he had provided, and this process led to the principal deciding on next steps she would take not only with the teacher observed but with all school faculty. The PS closed the visit by praising some of the movement in instructional practice he had observed since his previous visit, and again asking for feedback on the structure of the meeting and the tools used. He also responded to questions on possibilities for school-wide professional development and brainstormed with the principal ways to tailor the tools he had provided, to the specific needs of the principals he supervised. The visit ended after three hours (one hour longer than the previous visit).

Interview of high school principal supervisor. In his responses to questions meant to determine the alignment of his focus areas to the district's leadership framework, the high school principal supervisor supported the trend seen in the responses of his colleagues. He felt he spent the right amount of time on instruction. This perspective was supported by the extensive amount of time the principal supervisor spent analyzing the quality of teaching and learning with the principals he visited and their teams. However, the high school principal supervisor was the only

person to indicate he wished he had even more time to spend on instruction—a wish driven by his desire to examine data closely more often with his principals.

The high school principal supervisor also felt he spent the right amount of time on talent. Like his colleagues, he too equated this with helping principals staff their buildings, but also mentioned that he had spent time providing professional development sessions directly to department chairpersons for all of his schools. In a departure from all of the other principal supervisors, though, the high school principal supervisor communicated that he had spent more time than he planned to on both school culture and operations. In the area of school culture, the high school principal supervisor felt he spent an inordinate amount of time attempting to get schools to use proactive climate strategies to reduce suspensions (especially in schools with the neediest populations). In the area of operations, he felt he fielded an inordinate amount of requests from central office staff who were attempting to use his relationship with schools to address concerns with principal responsiveness. He also felt he spent an exorbitant amount of time on parent concerns. This feeling bled over into his response on the amount of time spent on family and community, where the principal supervisor's response wavered between feeling he spent the right amount on family and community issues, and feeling he spent too much time (when parent concerns were factored in).

None of these perspectives could be supported by the school visits since they entailed work that would have been done outside of schools. In the area of personal leadership, the principal supervisor felt he did not spend enough time working proactively. This was supported by what was observed during the school visits since

the high school PS spent no time talking with principals alone. All of his visits

involved at least one other member of the administrative team.

When asked questions related to the alignment of his work with the Honig

framework, the high school principal supervisor claimed to spend little to no time

utilizing the brokering strategy, and this claim was supported by the site visits

observed. At no time did the PS refer principals to anyone in central office during the

site visits. The high school principal supervisor also stated that he spent more of his

time than he had planned using the modeling strategy, and this also was substantiated

by the observations recording during the shadowing opportunity. The high school PS

definitely engaged in much more modeling than his elementary or middle school

colleagues. Not only did he model leadership practices, but he provided examples of

teacher practices as well.

The high school principal supervisor felt that he spent the right amount of

time on differentiated assistance, a response echoed by his colleagues. This was

supported by the fact that he tailored his feedback to what he saw in individual

classes, and by the fact that in one school the principal fully led his debriefing

protocol, while in the other, the PS resumed leadership mid-way through.

Interestingly, he was the only superintendent to indicate that he spent more time than

he had planned on developing and using tools. To support this, he explained that he

spent a lot of time gathering instructional articles and resources to support his schools

in moving toward national standards and refining their planning practices. Finally,

the high school PS concluded that he was spending the right amount of time engaging

principals as resources for each other, as he had already taken steps to increase his use of this strategy with his cohort.

When asked what he felt he needed to accomplish in the near future, the high school PS listed that he needed to complete norming walks with all of his schools, that he needed to review each school's comprehensive school plan and goals, that he needed to review the instructional and behavioral intervention plans for each of his schools, and that he needed to provide each school with feedback on their strategies related to raising their adjusted cohort graduation rates.

The high school principal supervisor's responses to questions about time allotment and a review of his calendar showed that he spent 19.5 hours in school visits, 13.5 hours in meetings and professional development, and 20 hours answering emails and responding to calls after hours.

Section 3—Analysis of Results

Findings based on the study's research questions. This study sought to answer the following four research questions through observing and interviewing elementary and secondary principal supervisors in a large urban school district:

1. What aspects of the *school programs* do principal supervisors decide to supervise or support at their individual schools and do these differ between elementary and secondary school principal supervisors?

2. What school-related, *district priorities* do principal supervisors perceive they are expected to impact, and do these perceptions differ between elementary and secondary school supervisors?

3. What *proportion of their time* do elementary and secondary school
   principal supervisors devote to *work inside and outside of schools* and
   for which purposes?

4. What *proportion of their time* do elementary and secondary school
   principal supervisors devote to each *Honig's five key supports*, and to
   supporting principals in developing their skills along the district's
   leadership standards?

This study did provide preliminary patterns and findings for all of these research
questions; but due to its limited scope, it has served more to define what questions
need to be further explored, than to provide definitive answers. Still, the following
preliminary findings did emerge as a result of the study.

   Findings for Question 1-school-specific supervised or impacted areas.
Question 1 asked what aspects of the school program principal supervisors supervised
or supported at their individual schools and whether or not these differed between
levels. Besides the specific interview questions principal supervisors were asked
about this, principal supervisors often mentioned various school-specific tasks for
which they felt responsible when they answered other questions. For instance, when
answering questions that categorized their work into Honig's framework or into the
leadership framework, principal supervisors often mentioned specific tasks for which
they felt responsible. When this happened, these responses were applied to the first
research question.

   In describing what tasks they actually felt responsible for executing in support
of their schools, much of what all four principal supervisors related pertained to

reviewing school improvement (comprehensive school) plans and principal and/or staff goals. Most principal supervisors mentioned monitoring intervention plans and completing school visits. Contrary to my expectation, although there were differences in their responses (Secondary principal supervisors both mentioned reviewing plans related to school culture, and the high school principal supervisor mentioned reviewing his schools' efforts toward increasing the graduation rate) none of the principal supervisors gave responses that focused on technical or operations-related items (such as responding to parent concerns or reviewing school budgets).

It is worthwhile to note two things: first, principal supervisors articulated that the more technical aspects of their jobs were usually concentrated into specific times of the year. For instance, hiring staff was a major concern during the summer, and reviewing and approving budgets took much of their attention between December and March. Second, while the tasks the principal supervisors mentioned all were related to improving schools, many of them were more administrative in nature (i.e. reviewing plans and providing feedback—some of these plans were each over 100 pages each).

In sum, principal supervisors at all levels felt responsible for instructional monitoring, plan review, and goal review. This was the same across levels. The difference was in what plans principal supervisors were planning to review. In addition to the comprehensive school plans that almost all supervisors mentioned (except the middle school superintendent) the secondary principal supervisors both mentioned plans related to school culture. One mentioned specifically reviewing school culture plans, and the other mentioned reviewing behavioral intervention

plans. Additionally, the high school principal supervisor also felt the need to address his schools' efforts toward increasing their graduation rates. This means there were clear differences between the elementary and secondary principal supervisors' perceived responsibilities.

Findings for Question 2-expectations of work on district priorities. Question Two sought to determine what tasks principal supervisors had to tackle that were not PS-generated, but were more systemic or based on district expectations. To answer this question, principal supervisors were given the opportunity to name district priorities among the tasks they felt responsible for in the near future.

The principal supervisors interviewed named tasks such as the intervention plans they needed to review, or the graduation rate monitoring for which they were responsible. These tasks could be considered district priorities since they were tasks based on what deputy chiefs required for all schools, rather than being PS or school-specific. However, the principal supervisors at all levels in this study appeared to value all of the district priorities as important parts of their work, such that they did not complain about any of those initiatives or express resentment at having to tackle them. Rather, they added questions about them to the list of items they planned to address while they were in schools or put those plans on the list of things they needed to review. Therefore, it did not appear that principal supervisors felt that district priorities detracted from their core work. Instead, they seemed to perceive district priorities as a part of their core work.

Findings for Question 3-allocations of time inside and outside of schools. This question sought to find out how principal supervisors felt about their ability to

appropriately balance of their time spent inside and outside of schools. For instance, did principal supervisors feel they were spending too much time in meetings, and not enough time in schools? To answer the question of how they were balancing their time, principal supervisors were asked directly in their interviews how many hours they spent in schools providing direct support, how much time they spent out of schools providing support, and what other ways they felt they spent their time professionally. I also examined the calendars of principal supervisors to triangulate their perceptions of how they were spending their time.

Principal supervisors at all levels overwhelmingly felt that the bulk of their time was spent on school visits and that this was the right proportion of time spent. Additionally, principal supervisors seemed to spend similar amounts of time in meetings with central office staff or in professional development (since all principal supervisors, regardless of level, had to come to the same meetings once a week). Where time allotment differed was in the amount of time superintendents reported spending on work outside of the workday. One principal supervisor (PS) reported spending three hours a week on work outside of the school day while the high school PS reported spending twenty hours a week on work outside of the workday. A note here is that the phrasing of the questions related to time allotment did not allow for reporting of travel time or amount of time spent working at schools (only perceptions of that time). Furthermore, principal supervisors' perceptions of how they spent their time were largely self-reported since the sensitive and evaluative nature of their work did not permit me to collect artifacts that could be used in this study.

Also relevant was that the principal supervisors at all levels perceived they were expected to address parent concerns and expressed that this was an unexpected drain on their time. Interestingly, although all felt parent concerns impacted their ability to address their core work, no principal supervisors mentioned this on their list of tasks to accomplish in the near future. The only difference among levels in this area was that the high school PS felt obliged to do much more to impact his schools' cultures and operations. This dealt with things such as suspensions, truancy, and graduation rates.

Findings for Question 4- allocation of time to Honig's five key supports and development in District B's leadership standards. This question asked what proportion of their time elementary and secondary school principal supervisors devoted to each of Honig's five key supports, and to supporting principals in developing their skills along the district's leadership standards. District B's leadership framework required that principals show proficiency in six areas: Instruction, Talent (staff hiring and development), School Culture, Operations, Family and Community and Personal Leadership. To answer this question, principal supervisors were asked whether they spent the right amount, less or more than desired, or no time at all engaged in work on each of the leadership standards as well as on utilizing the key practices articulated by Honig. Findings related to this question were also informed by my observations of principal supervisors, and by a review of their calendars.

Time spent on the Leadership Framework.

Interviews. Table 2 illustrates the range of responses received when District B principal supervisors were asked about to the degree to which they focused their support on building principals' capacity in the district's leadership standards.

Table 2: Perceptions of time spent on District B leadership standards

Time Spent on:	Elem. Supt. A	Elem. Supt. B	MS Supt.	HS Supt.
Instruction	Right amount	Right amount	Right amount	Right amount
Talent	Right amount	More than planned	Right amount	Right amount
School Culture	Less than planned	Right amount	Less than planned	More than planned
Operations	Little to none	Little to none	Little to none	More than planned
Family/Community	Little to none	Little to none	Little to none	More than planned
Personal Leadership	Right amount	Less than planned	Right amount	Less than planned

All principal supervisors, across levels, felt they were spending the right amount of time on instruction, and most felt they were spending the right amount of time on talent. Elementary PS2 felt she was spending more time than she had planned on talent, but when probed, clarified that there were "peaks and valleys" to her time spent on talent and that the peaks occurred mainly in the summer months when leadership vacancies required her to hire school staff in lieu of the principal. However, in the area of school culture, the high school PS was the only principal supervisor to feel that he was allocating a disproportionate amount of his time to this area. This may have been related to a district initiative that required secondary schools to proactively address the disproportionate numbers of students who were being suspended in District B high schools. (In 2014-15, 26% of District B suspensions were of elementary school students; 29% were attributed to middle

school students and 35% were attributed to high school students, internal document, September, 2015).

The time allocated to school culture may also be related to the unique needs of middle and high school students. Lynne, Graber, Nichols, Brooks-Gunne, and Botvin (2007) found that "both aggression and delinquency escalate" during the middle and high school years (between 11-16 years of age) and that they "peak at age 16 for both male and female students" (p. 7). They found that "crowded, urban, inner city environments and…exposure to violent crimes" can aggravate these behaviors but also found that these behaviors were linked to puberty (p. 7). Whatever the cause, it was clear that District B's high schools experienced greater school culture challenges. In fact, of the ten schools with the highest truancy rates in the district, nine of them were high schools. One was a middle school. The average truancy rate for those nine schools was 31%. Meanwhile, none of the district's neediest elementary schools' truancy rates exceeded three percent (internal data, 2015). District B's high school drop-out rate was estimated to be a staggering 23% of students, with an additional 16% identified as "at-risk" (internal data, 2015). These data show clear patterns supporting the secondary principal supervisors' perceptions that they needed to focus on school culture.

Similarly, in both operations and family/community, the high school PS was the only principal supervisor to indicate he was spending more time than he planned in these areas. This may have been because high school principal supervisors were responsible for essential functions that fell into the "Operations" category, such as scheduling and graduation. Although elementary schools often had to address

schedule and promotion exercises as well, the complexity of the four-period,

alternating schedule that needed to be tailored to each students' specific graduation

needs in high school, seemed to require far more attention from the high school PS

than scheduling and promotion required of elementary principal supervisors. Finally,

in the area of personal leadership, PS responses were varied; with equal amounts of

elementary and secondary principal supervisors indicating they spent the right amount

of time on this.

      Site visits. When analyzing PS practice for *what* they focused on in their site

visits (i.e. through the lens of the district's leadership framework) all four principal

supervisors, regardless of the level, focused their site visit efforts on Instruction,

Talent Management, and Personal Leadership. However, the prioritization of those

three areas varied considerably. For instance, Elementary PS1 spent the bulk of his

time on developing personal leadership and talent management almost equally, and a

similar trend was observed when analyzing how the middle school principal

supervisor allocated his support (mostly focused on developing personal leadership,

with talent management a distant second). Meanwhile, the other elementary principal

supervisor and the high school principal supervisor both spent the vast majority of

their time leading discussions of instruction. In the site visits observed, it did not

appear that the prioritization of leadership-framework support was a function of level

served.

      Time spent on Key Practices Articulated by Honig. The five key practices

specified by Honig as integral to the practice of principal supervisors were modeling,

brokering, providing differentiated assistance, developing and using tools and engaging principals as resources for one another.

Interviews. As Table 3 shows, when questioned during the interviews, most principal supervisors felt they spent the right amount of time or little to no time brokering, and this perception was evenly split among levels. All principal supervisors felt they were differentiating assistance the right amount, in that they were spending more time with new principals and those principals who need more support.

Table 3: Perceptions of time spent on Honig's best practices

Time Spent on:	Elem. Supt. A	Elem. Supt. B	MS Supt.	HS Supt.
Brokering	Little to none	Right amount	Right amount	Little to none
Modeling	Little to none	Less than planned	Less than planned	More than planned
Differentiated Assistance	Right amount	Right amount	Right amount	Right amount
Dev./Using Tools	Right amount	Right amount	Less than planned	More than planned
Colleagues as Resources	Right amount	Less than planned	Less than planned	Right amount

One area where the high school PS differed greatly from his elementary and even middle school colleagues was in the area of modeling. In the interview, the high school PS said he spent more time than he planned modeling best practices for his principals and their teams, and this was supported by what was observed in his site visit. There were a number of possible reasons for this, but one may be that traditionally high school principals deferred to teachers as content experts and, therefore, dabbled less in what was happening inside the classroom. Rather, they spent their time managing the operations of the school more as a chief executive officer than an instructional leader. Therefore, the idea that they should function as

instructional leaders required much more modeling of what that might even look like—especially since high school contained such a broad range of contents to lead.

Site visits. When looking for patterns on *how* District B principal supervisors provided support during site visits, the results showed that all principal supervisors had similar styles. The two elementary principal supervisors were very closely aligned. Both practiced differentiated assistance with their principal more than any other strategy. At first glance, the middle school principal supervisor appeared to have engaged principals as resources for each other more than any other strategy, but upon closer examination, it became clear that this was more due to the timeframe of his observation than a marked difference in practice. This is because, due to an impending promotion, the middle school PS had to be shadowed during the latter part of the summer, whereas the other principal supervisors were shadowed once the school year began.   The day the middle school principal supervisor chose for his shadowing experience also happened to be the district's professional development day, and this meant there was less flexibility in the type of support the middle school PS could provide to the principals he supervised. However, the data collected does show that the bulk of the middle school principal supervisor's time was spent coaching principals, and that time spent could also be categorized as providing differentiated assistance.

The high school principal supervisors' patterns, though, did differ from his elementary colleagues in a noticeable way. Neither of the elementary principal supervisors used the modeling strategy in any major way, but that was the strategy used most often by the high school PS. Additionally, while the high school PS did

use the differentiating assistance strategy often in his visit, he was almost equally as likely to develop and use tools. No other PS used tools as frequently or as deeply as the high school PS.

The work of most principal supervisors did not fit neatly into Honig's categories, with much of the support provided by these educational leaders extending into more than one category. Equally surprising was the emergence of two previously unnamed strategies during the site visits that seemed key to the work of principal supervisors in District B, but which were not explicitly named in the other work examined on this role. These two strategies were *instructional calibration* and *coaching*. Every site visit observed showed multiple instances where these two strategies were used, and in some cases they were used much more frequently than the other strategies that were identified by Honig.

Honig in both her 2010 and 2012 work mentioned five best practices that showed promise for high-functioning principal supervisors: modeling, brokering, using and developing tools, providing differentiated assistance and engaging principals as resources for each other (Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton & Newton, p. vi, 2010). In later work, Honig (2012) also mentioned a sixth promising practice (engaging in joint work, p. 746) but in none of these works does she highlight instructional calibration or coaching as key strategies used by principal supervisors. However, during my observations of District B principal supervisors, all used the strategies of *instructional calibration* and *coaching* as much as they did any of Honig's key strategies, and in some cases these strategies were used far more.

Instructional calibration. District B's version of instructional calibration was very similar to what the Institute for Learning called a "learning walk" and defined as "a highly structured set of activities for the observation and interpretation of teaching and learning…" (Goldman et al., 2008, p.2). The learning walk protocol described in the University of Pittsburgh publication is much more structured than those observed in District B, but there were definitely shared elements. These included "orientation of walkers, classroom visits [which could include discussions with teachers and students and examination of the walls], hall talk, and a debrief" (Goldman et al., 2008, p.14). Every site visit I attended when classes were in session involved an instructional calibration experience. This involved the PS, principal, and/or other administrative team members walking the building together, examining classroom practice, sharing perspectives on observations and using those observations to determine next steps for individual teachers as well as for the school or division of the school. All of the principals observed seemed to find this experience valuable; with one participant stating that they "now know what to look for" and another saying he "appreciated the opportunity to norm with his colleagues." Since this appeared to be a central part of the site visits of all principal supervisors, who used this strategy as an opportunity to assess the talent in schools, to coach principals on how to manage that talent, and to norm principals' perceptions of teaching and learning, this strategy seemed to deserve a more central role in the conversation about the work of principal supervisors.

Coaching. The other promising strategy that emerged in the analysis of how principal supervisors provided support was the strategy of *coaching*. Bloom defined

blended coaching as "the practice of providing deliberate support to another individual to help him/her to clarify and/or to achieve goals" (Bloom, G., Castagna, C., Moir, E., and Warren, B., 2005, p. 5).   Bloom et al. further explained this practice in the following way.

> Effective coaches must master a number of fundamental skills, including listening, paraphrasing, questioning, and assessing the specific needs and contexts of the coachee...[They] often use multiple strategies during the course of any given coaching session. The coach may play a facilitative role, guiding the coachee to learning through the use of feedback and reflective questions [or] an instructional role, and provide expert information, advice, and resources (p.8).

Outside of the instructional walks, the majority of principal supervisors' time in District B was spent on coaching of leaders. When examining the most common strategies used by one elementary PS, the use of coaching strategies far exceeded the use of any other strategy (except instructional calibration, with which it was tied). The second elementary PS used coaching more than her combined use of modeling; developing and using tools; and engaging principals as resources for each other. She also used coaching strategies twice as much as she used brokering. This was even truer for the middle school PS, who used coaching strategies more than all of the other Honig strategies put together. Interestingly, it was the high school PS who used the most varied approach. He modeled, provided differentiated assistance, and developed and used tools more than he explicitly coached, but he used the strategy of instructional calibration almost twice as much as he used any one other strategy.

While principals were often the subjects of this coaching, they were not the only ones. Principal supervisors extended coaching to assistant principals, resident principals, instructional coaches and other leaders within the building as well.

Here as well, there is the conundrum that some of Honig's 2012 strategies, (such as a focus on joint work) could fit into the coaching category or the instructional calibration bucket, or vice versa. However, given that these two strategies played such a pronounced role in the work of the District B principal supervisors, it might be worthwhile for future studies to examine whether they should be given a more explicit role in the articulation of best practices for principal supervisors.

It is true that the above conclusions must be handled carefully. The work of the principal supervisor is not clear cut, so strategies can often fall into more than one category. For instance, coaching could fall into the realm of providing differentiated assistance, as could modeling or using tools. Engaging principals as resources for each other could also be categorized as modeling (just done by a different person). This blending of strategies should be noted in any discussion of which strategies principal supervisors use. Still, despite this blurring of strategies, patterns did emerge that addressed the research questions identified.

Other findings. There were other patterns that emerged from the data that did not necessarily address a specific research question, but which are relevant in the discussion of the work of elementary and secondary principal supervisors. These patterns emerged in response to questions on principal supervisors' backgrounds,

experiences, and philosophies; as well as in answers to questions that asked for principal supervisors' general perceptions of (or recommendations for) their role.

Patterns in principal supervisors' interview responses related to backgrounds, experiences and philosophies. Given that all of the principal supervisors in District B went through the same hiring protocol, and that all of those participating in this study were hired by the same team, it was not surprising to find that all had similar backgrounds. All had teaching experience as well as experience as an assistant principal and principal. All had Bachelor's degrees and Master's degrees in Education. Both of the secondary principal supervisors (and one of the elementary ones) had specialized in social studies/history during their undergraduate study. The other elementary PS had a Bachelor's degree in Curriculum and Instruction. This pattern suggests that experience in school-based leadership as well as with teaching content may help equip principal supervisors for their role, regardless of the level served. Across levels, almost all of the principal supervisors mentioned training in blended coaching specifically as essential for success in their role. The PS who was the exception mentioned skills that could easily fall into this category ("dealing with skill gaps…holding difficult conversations," etc.).

Patterns in Principal Supervisor perceptions of their role. Principal supervisors also had intriguing ideas about how their roles could be adjusted. When asked for their perceptions of the role, principal supervisors talked about a variety of highlights including their ability to impact the work of schools, and the joy of working with respected colleagues.   One principal supervisor said the role was, "the ideal position."

However when asked whether the role should be re-examined or for general ideas about the role, almost all, regardless of the level, spoke of the need to have additional support staff, the need to clarify the principal supervisor's role for others in the organization and the need to address parent concerns in a different way. The high school PS, in particular, spoke of spending up to twenty additional hours working outside of the school day to answer emails, consult with principals, and address parent concerns. All of the principal supervisors spoke of working outside of the school day, but none to the degree expressed by the high school PS.

Section 4: Conclusion

Limitations of the study. There were a number of limitations of this study. The sample was small—only four principal supervisors were included and the results will not necessarily be very relevant to districts that have not adopted or have a very different concept of the principal supervisor role (e.g. different concepts of the degree of control or autonomy; instances where the district superintendent may also function as the principal supervisor). In addition, the questions did not specifically measure the amount of time principal supervisors allocated to a particular strategy or standard. Therefore, judgements regarding what was perceived to be "the right amount of time" could vary. For instance, one supervisor could have expressed that the right amount of time allocated to a strategy was 15 hours per week or 80% of the time spent in a school visit while another could have felt the right amount was two hours per week, and 15% of the time spent in a school visit. The interview questions did not capture that potential difference. Additionally, there was unavoidable researcher bias, as I previously served as a high school principal supervisor, and currently supervise high

112

school principal supervisors. Finally, I was not able to collect some artifacts that could have been valuable for triangulation purposes (such as monthly feedback from principal supervisors to principals) due to the sensitive and evaluative nature of some of those artifacts. Still, this study does pose questions and ideas that could be valuable to many urban districts that have begun to recognize the value of this model of principal supervisor.

General Findings. Specifically, the work of high school PS role, in particular, does appear to have different challenges than the work of the elementary superintendents—not just in the time demanded by the unique school cultures of high schools, but in the time required for operations management and parent concerns as well. The good news is that these challenges did not seem to impede those principal supervisors determined to have a major impact on the instructional leadership in their buildings, from doing just that. In many ways, including finding principal supervisors with the right background and focus, providing them with the right professional learning experiences, and establishing clear expectations for an instructional focus, District B has gotten it right.

Recommendations for District B. Still, some ideas surfaced during this study that it may benefit District B to explore further. First, it appears the district practice of directing all or most parent concerns to principal supervisors robs them of precious time that could be better spent on instruction. While supervisors of principals would always need to address some parent concerns, the majority of these could be handled by other personnel, and this would free up time for principal supervisors to engage in longer site visits and/or more follow-up visits. All levels of principal supervisors,

when separately interviewed, expressed the need for this, but the issue seemed to impact the high school PS the most, as high schools tend to have more students and parents, and those parents have needs with more high-stakes implications (i.e. graduation, or college entry).

The second idea for District B to consider is how to clarify and communicate better the functions and priorities in the new principal supervisor role. All of the principal supervisors interviewed said their priorities lay with Instruction and Talent Management and that this was where the bulk of their time was spent. Most also lamented having inadequate time to deal with personal leadership to the desired level, with the secondary principal supervisors adding School Culture as a desired priority (should time permit it). This means that (according to principal supervisors) even in a best-case scenario Operations and Family/Community were not priorities, and they did not devote much time to these areas. Yet principal supervisors were expected to evaluate principals in these areas, and, for this reason, offices related to these areas clamored for their time and attention.

The district will need to decide if it wants principal supervisors to focus their attention in these areas, and if so, how it can support them in doing so. An alternate option might be for principal supervisors to share the evaluation responsibility in these areas. This might facilitate other offices dealing with schools more directly on these issues, but it also would be a major departure from current practice. Whatever is decided, the idea of clarifying the primary purpose of the role and communicating that to other offices was paramount for principal supervisors.

Finally, three out of the four principal supervisors (both of the secondary and one of the elementary) expressed the need for support staff to allow them to monitor school progress better and provide support in-between their visits. One elementary PS proposed that reducing the span of control even further could be a viable alternative to this, but secondary principal supervisors were clear in their desire for instructionally savvy staff. They specifically wanted staff who could help schools follow through on visions or recommendations articulated by the PS, expertly monitor progress in instructional areas, and help schools use data to monitor their progress toward expressed goals.

The most important finding though is that there were distinct differences between the work of elementary and secondary principal supervisors. These executive staff members were able to overcome these differences, but only with considerable personal and professional sacrifice. The high school PS was the most likely of all of the principal supervisors to state that he was not able to do the job to the degree he wanted. Both he and the middle school principal supervisor pointed to school culture as the area where they wanted to provide more support but felt unable to do so because of time constraints. This could mean that high school principal supervisors need additional staff members that could focus exclusively on secondary school culture, or it could mean that secondary principal supervisors need fewer schools to supervise than their elementary school counterparts. The district could decide that neither approach is the right one, and brainstorm a markedly different resolution. Certainly, no decisions could be based on this study alone, for the reasons

already articulated; however this study should definitely provoke further inquiry in this field, perhaps involving more principal supervisors from more school districts.

Despite the fact that there were clearly things that District B needed to consider in its implementation of the PS role, the district is to be commended for the progress it has made with this innovative approach. If the goal was to provide schools with principal supervisors who were dedicated to improving instructional programs, and who possessed the knowledge and skills to help school leaders do that, then based on observations and interviews in this study, that mission was accomplished at both the elementary and secondary levels in District B. There certainly appeared to be differences in the approaches taken and challenges expressed between levels, but it is also clear that principals at all levels are receiving a level of instructional support that some might consider unprecedented.

This is important work. In the past, most educators might not have even considered principal supervisors as a link in the chain to elevating the success of all students, much less considered how to differentiate that role. It has long felt like the keys to academic success lie with students, parents, communities, teachers and principals, and that is still true; at the classroom level, individual teachers, students, and parents are the greatest levers for change. At the school level, that equation definitely includes principals (and probably even the often overlooked assistant principals). However, society is no longer satisfied with success at the individual classroom or school level. This may be why data is not just reported at the classroom or school level anymore. It is reported for whole districts.

Yes, a good teacher can make all the difference, but a good principal can create a school full of successful teaching and learning in the vast majority of classrooms.   Likewise, a good principal supervisor can lead to groups of schools meeting desired goals for college and career readiness and thus lead to systemic success as no one else can. The idea is now emerging that our society's success depends on whole school systems producing successful, college and career ready students. Based on my experience as a teacher, an assistant principal, a principal, a principal supervisor and now a deputy chief, the role of the principal supervisor is one of the most important levers that can be used to bring about consistent, instructional change at a systemic level.

Appendix A-Explanatory Email

Dear Colleague,

I am a Deputy Chief in your school district and am a current University of

Maryland doctoral student exploring how the roles of elementary and

Secondary School Principal Supervisors are alike and different. As an

_____Principal Supervisor, I am requesting your participation in

this study. Please note that your participation is strictly voluntary. Also,

know that even though your responses will be completely anonymous and

your identity will not be explicitly linked to your responses in any way, it

might still be possible for audiences familiar with the District to discern your

identity. Your participation would involve allowing me to shadow you for

one full day as you provide support to a school, logging ways you support

schools outside of direct face-to-face support for one week and engaging in a

60-90-minute interview to discuss what tasks you feel responsible for as a

Principal Supervisor. If you decide to participate in this study, please carefully

read and return the attached informed consent letter.

Appendix B-Informed Consent Letter

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study of the differences and similarities of principal supervisors at the elementary and secondary school levels. This study will help the district better understand how the principal supervisor role is alike or different at different levels, and could inform the district regarding best practices associated with various levels of principal supervisors.

Your participation would involve allowing me to shadow you for one full day as you provide support to a school, logging ways you support schools outside of direct face-to-face support for one week and engaging in a 60-90-minute interview to discuss what tasks you feel responsible for as a Principal Supervisor.

This study satisfies a portion of the requirements for completion of a University of Maryland doctoral program. Your participation in this study is voluntary, meaning that you can choose not to answer any or all of the questions. Your participation or choice not to participate will not impact your employment or status with this district in any way. Your responses are also anonymous—meaning your name will not be connected to your responses in any way, and any identifying features in your responses will be deleted in order to preserve your anonymity. Despite best efforts, it may be possible for persons familiar with this district to determine the identities of some participants.

Therefore, to ensure your comfort with any information collected during the observation, log or interview portions of this study, raw observation notes will be shared with you prior to analysis, and patterns and synopses will be shared with you after analysis. If you consider any of the information collected to be harmful or would like it removed, that information will be immediately withdrawn from the study and destroyed.

If you have any questions about this study, please email them to_____ at _____. If you agree to participate in the survey, please attach this letter to an independent email, and type the following phrase in the body of your email. "I agree that I have been told about the details of participating in this study and wish to participate." This email should be sent to _____and will indicate that you have been informed about the details of the study and wish to participate.

Appendix C-Sample Principal Supervisor Log

Table 1

Sample Principal Supervisor Log

Time Frame	Activity	Purpose
9-10:00 a.m.	Responded to emails	Addressed parent complaints and principal requests
10:00-11:00 a.m.	Attended grading policy meeting	To give input on a new grading policy for Secondary Schools
11:45 a.m. -12:45 p.m.	Met with data specialist	To discuss presentation at next cluster meeting
12:45-1:00 p.m.	Responded to parent phone calls	To address parent concerns
1:00-3:30 p.m.	Attended Principal Supervisor PD session	To receive PD
3:30-5:00 p.m.	Worked on feedback documents for principals	To share feedback on what happened during a recent observation.

Appendix D-PS1 Site Visit Notes

Shadowing Notes, District B Superintendent (Principal Supervisor)-1, September 9, 2015

7:30 a.m.

a. The superintendent greets the principal outside of the school. 7:30ES1H
b. As the superintendent enters the building, he describes historical issues within the school. He shares that there were issues with student fighting, and that staff complained to him about the state of the school on multiple occasions. 7:30ES1H
c. A staff member greets the superintendent warmly and says, "Welcome to the new _____ Elementary School." The superintendent greets the staff member by name. The superintendent shares that he recruited this staff member and that the staff member is calling it new because of the new climate fostered by the new principal. 7:30ES1H

7:35

a. Once in the office conference room, the principal gives the superintendent a copy of her staff roster. 7:35ES1H
b. The superintendent asks the principal to pull up an email he sent prior to the visit that details the agenda and focus areas for the visit. 7:35ES1H
c. He asks her how she is feeling given that it is week 3. 7:35ES1H
d. The principal shares that she is getting to know the different staff members and is having conversations about people being where they need to be. 7:35ES1H
e. The principal shares that there are two different teams in the building—an Academic Leadership Team and a School Leadership Team; one handles academic planning and one everything else. The superintendent takes notes in a notebook.7:35ES1H
f. The principal mentions that there has been lots of confusion about job roles. She mentions the area of coordinating substitutes as an example. She points out a chart on her white board where she has listed key leadership and administrative staff and their roles. She says she met with her team recently to discuss and clarify this.7:35ES1H
g. The principal tells the superintendent that she also had to clarify and monitor staff being on their duty posts at recess as there have been a few student scuffles that she believed were the result of inadequate adult monitoring. 7:35ES1H
h. The superintendent asks the roles of a few of the leadership staff listed on the board.
i. As a result of his questions, the principal mentions that in the past, the school had not been using a specific technology program, even though the district had paid for it. The principal also talks about enlisting staff members to orient and assist new teachers. 7:35ES1H

j. The superintendent queries whether one of the new teachers is shared with another school. When the principal affirms the teacher is shared, the supt. asks if she has contacted the other principal. 7:35ES1H

k. The principal agrees she needs to do this and jots herself a note. 7:35ES1H

l. The superintendent says the two principals need to share ideas around support for the new teacher. 7:35ES1H

m. The supt. praises the principal for focusing staff on using the technology-based literacy intervention program properly, and asks if there are any technology-based intervention programs. There is another. 7:35ES1H

n. The superintendent pushes to make sure a specific building leader monitors fidelity to the technology programs. He reiterates his support for the two technology-based academic intervention programs and affirms that schools that use these programs with fidelity make "great gains." 7:35ES1H

o. The principal agrees and says she is focused on providing training in the two programs. 7:35ES1H

p. The supt. reminds the principal that in the email he sent as a follow up to his last visit, he stated he wanted the principal to focus on attendance, talent management and student satisfaction. 7:35ES1H

q. He asks the principal for her thoughts on her school staff (talent management). He asks the principal to categorize teachers into levels/degree of needed support. One category was teachers needing intensive support, another--teachers who needed some, and the other was teachers who had extensive expertise that should be emulated. 7:35ES1H

r. The principal and superintendent go through the staff roster and categorize the teachers according to support needed. 4 need intensive support, 7 need some support, 8 need little support, 2 had extensive practices that should be emulated. 7:35ES1H

s. During the conversation, the superintendent mentions that at a later date, he wants to strategize with the principal how she will help teachers understand that earlier evaluation ratings may have been inflated. 7:35ES1H

t. As the conversation commences, the superintendent asks clarifying questions about each teacher and affirms points made by the principal that resonate with him (use of data to focus teachers on the need to make practice adjustments). 7:35ES1H

u. The superintendent encourages the principal to reach out to a colleague who had the same leadership challenge. 7:35ES1H

v. When the principal mentions one especially effective teacher, the superintendent mentions that he fought to keep her in the school by building a relationship with her.

w. The superintendent asks to visit the morning collaborative meeting. 7:35ES1H

x. The principal agrees and describes what happens in the different meetings each day of the week. 7:35ES1H

y. The superintendent asks how teachers have responded to the morning collaborative meetings. 7:35ES1H

z. The principal relates that staff are comfortable with it, because she had them vote on having them. She thinks they like it, and expected change. 7:35ES1H

aa. When the principal mentions another teacher who is not optimally effective yet, the superintendent expresses disappointment, because "that was one of my hires."

bb. The Principal expresses that the staff member could improve as accountability is increased. 7:35ES1H

cc. The Superintendent reminds the principal that they will end their conversation soon so he can visit the morning collaborative. 7:35ES1H

dd. The principal and supt. discuss a teacher who is returning despite an ineffective rating and what the plan will be regarding that teacher. 7:35ES1H

ee. The supt. models a conversation with that teacher. 7:35ES1H

ff. When the principal leaves briefly, the superintendent extols her leadership and proclaims that he was determined to recruit her for his cluster. He mentions that he loves his team of principals. 7:35ES1H

gg. When the principal returns, the two continue their review of each teacher. He recommends that the principal coach a particular teacher who is interested in leadership. He asks if she has allocated time for coaching conversations. 7:35ES1H

hh. The principal says she had not really done that to the degree she wanted, and makes a note to do that. 7:35ES1H

ii. The superintendent again praises the time the principal has taken to define roles in the school, and mentions that a previous attempt to do this with a principal fell apart.

jj. As the conversation closes, the superintendent asks a few operational questions. He asks about enrollment, and adjures the principal to "stay on top of that." He asks about another specific staff member. 7:35ES1H

kk. The superintendent shares that he knows the principal was applauded at the end of her last faculty meeting. He praises her, "You're doing a fantastic job; I can say that to you because I know you're going to 'stay hungry.' And you know I am going to continue to push you."

ll. The superintendent asks if the principal is willing to host the next cluster meeting, which is an honor he extends to principal with practices that could be emulated. He mentions that he knows things are going well because there have been no parent complaints. 7:35ES1H

mm. The principal recounts a similar compliment from the school resource officer. 7:35ES1H

9:00

a. The superintendent and principal move to the hallway to begin classroom observations. 9:00ES1H
b. The superintendent asks what the observations will focus on. 9:00ES1H
c. The Principal says the walk will focus on alignment of activities with objectives. 9:00ES1H
d. While waiting for other members of the leadership team to join them, the superintendent mentions that he assumed all of the hiring functions the year prior, and that he eliminated a coordinator position, exchanged a different position for another type, brought in someone from his previous school, hired an Assistant Principal, and hired a support staff member. 9:00ES1H

9:07

a. The principal, two assistant principals and the superintendent visit several classes to observe practice. The superintendent tells the principal that he would like her to conduct the debrief. 9:07ES1H
b. The team visits a grade level class, and a non-core class. During the transition, the superintendent gleefully points out that the halls are clear and exclaims how thrilled he is that teacher collaboration is happening. 9:07ES1H
c. The team visits a second class of the same level as the first. The supt. asks why the timing of the class does not align with that of the first class observed.

9:39

a. The team visits a third class of the same level, after which the superintendent suggests the team debrief in the way they normally would. 9:39ES1H
b. The principal asks the team to share highlights or questions that are not judgmental. She also mentions that they will plan for follow up with specific teachers. 9:39ES1H
c. Back in the principal's conference room, the team discusses each teacher's attempt to implement a literacy program. They discuss use of objectives, use of aides, lesson plans, scheduling, implementation of the program with fidelity, and alignment to standards. 9:39ES1H
d. The principal asks if the objectives and activities matched in the rooms observed. Building leaders respond and the principal takes notes on the conversation. 9:39ES1H
e. The principal celebrates that the non-academic teacher has changed practice as a result of previous feedback. The team clarifies next steps for this teacher. 9:39ES1H
f. The superintendent interrupts the debrief and praises one assistant principal for her detailed observations. He shares that the team has answered most of his questions, and asks how they will celebrate the music teacher. The principal responds they will send an email or note to the teacher. 9:39ES1H

g. The superintendent praises some of the things he saw: 99% of students engaged; students looked ready to learn; the team is on point with their assessment of the literacy program's implementation. 9:39ES1H

h. The supt. asks where a specific teacher was and why the pacing in some classes was different. He finishes by asking more specific questions about following up with teachers and monitoring implementation of feedback. 9:39ES1H

i. The supt. praises that the school is off to a good start. 9:39ES1H

j. The principal shares that the supt. warned earlier that the school has experienced early success in other years that has not been sustained. 9:39ES1H

k. The superintendent cautions the team to hold teachers accountable and support classes with behavior concerns in some of the other grades that weren't observed during this visit. 9:39ES1H

10:04

a. The superintendent leaves school 1 and drives to school 2. He does not stop for lunch. 10:00ES1Tr

School 2-10:31 a.m.

a. When the superintendent arrives at the new school he describes how thrilled he is with the leadership of this 3rd year principal. 10:31ES1T

b. The superintendent apologizes to the principal for being late and says he was delayed at his previous school. 10:31ES1T

c. The principal has an agenda for the day mapped out already and gathers members of his leadership team for a quick conference. The team includes his IB Coordinator, and Asst. Principal and his Operations Manager (who was previously a teacher). He explains that another teacher leader and the Instructional Coach will join future walks but are not available on this day. 10:31ES1T

d. Once the team is convened, the principle introduces the walk and explains that they will be looking for student engagement based on previous work done by the ALT. He asks the team to try to be objective and specific, then models expectations of evidence collection. He shares that both new and veteran teachers will be observed during this walk. 10:31ES1T

10:45

a. The team visits a 1st grade class where students are discussing how a character persevered. The superintendent talks to one student playing by himself in the corner. All other students are highly engaged in the lesson. The superintendent takes notes on his phone.10:45ES1T

b. A behavior matrix and behavioral expectations are posted in the hallway. 10:45ES1T

c. The team visits a 2nd grade class where the teacher is reading to students, but interrupts the lesson multiple times to address student behavior. 10:45ES1T
d. The team then moves onto a 3rd grade class where a teacher is teaching math. The interactions in this class are primarily from the teacher to the students. A number of students are punished by having to move their names on a chart to a lower rating for failing to pay attention or for answering questions incorrectly. 10:45ES1T
e. In the last class observed, the students are facilitating their own learning in small groups—some using manipulatives. Students are required to explain how they derived their answers. 10:45ES1T
f. While in the hall, the superintendent shares that he believes choosing the right principals has made all the difference in his cluster, and that he loves all of his principals. 10:45ES1T

11:24

a. The superintendent asks the principal to lead the debrief. 11:24ES1T
b. The principal establishes that the team will discuss each teacher for five minutes and that they will cover "glows and grows." He also reminds the team that they are looking for evidence of engagement and specific strategies that were utilized. 11:24ES1T
c. The team gives feedback on each teacher, then the principal shares feedback on each class. For the first class, the team agrees that the teacher needs to facilitate conversations between students. The superintendent takes notes in his notebook and on his phone. 11:24ES1T
d. Regarding the second class, the team notices that 8 out of 19 students were engaged. The principal even uses eye movement to determine level of engagement. (7 students had wandering eyes). The principal praises particularly astute comments made by members of his team. He challenges other statements made by team members, "Can you bring that back to our focus area of engagement?" The team determines strategies for the second teacher (anchor charts, agendas). 11:24ES1T
e. Regarding the third class, the principal asks the team to share thoughts, then shares his own observations (students were given inadequate opportunities to express their thinking). He concludes there is a lot of work to be done in this class. He pushes the team to come up with clear next steps for this teacher (conversation regarding classroom management strategies, all students having something "in front of them", partnering strategies, requiring students to explain their answers, giving wait time). 11:24ES1T
f. Regarding the fourth class, the team celebrates that the teacher provided students with multiple ways to engage in the learning and that she used clear, cooperative learning. The principal pushes to team to consider whether the content was grade-level appropriate or adequately rigorous for the grade. 11:24ES1T

g. The superintendent interjects because of time constraints. He shares commonalities (+/deltas). He says he saw appropriate visuals, and was most proud of the level of student engagement. He also praises the use of academic vocabulary. He asks about the student who was isolated in one of the classes, asks how the student is being supported, and cautions that he wants to make sure the student returns to inclusion in instruction. He compliments a first year teacher observed, and compliments another for being so patient with a student with special needs. He also compliments the leadership team for their interactions and says their feedback was "on point." 11:24ES1T

h. The supt. points out the complexities of addressing issues in another teacher's class. He asks how the group will share feedback with teachers. The principal responds that they will follow the Bambrick-Santoyo model. He says they will change the protocol for instructional rounds. The supt. asks about timing and follow up for feedback. The team shares that they make feedback public using a shared google doc that all members of the academic leadership team can access. 11:24ES1T

i. The supt. asks the principal to have his Academic Leadership Team present at the next cluster meeting on how they make feedback public to all team members. 11:24ES1T

j. The superintendent asks the principal how praise is shared. The principal shares the school's strategies for sharing both individual and collective positive feedback (staff bulletin, individual conferences/notes). 11:24ES1T

k. The superintendent finishes with asking how the team will open up the exceptional teacher's practice to others. The principal shares they will use instructional rounds and peer observation. 11:24ES1T

l. The supt. asks if the school will videotape the exceptional teacher's practice. 11:24ES1T

m. The principal agrees that is a good idea. 11:24ES1T

n. The superintendent asks for 20 additional minutes with the principal to debrief the visit, and notes that he will next need to attend a mandatory District central office staff meeting. 11:24ES1T

o. During the meeting, he tells the principal that everything observed was fantastic. 11:24ES1T

p. He says he is going to don his "coaching hat" and asks the principal how his presence influences the interaction of the group. The principal smiles and acknowledges he has been thinking about that a lot. He relates his struggle with shared leadership. He admits to trying to lead the thinking in the desired route. He mentions that he is particular about outcomes and wants to make sure that he achieves them at the highest level. 11:24ES1T

q. The supt. compliments the principal on his honesty and says this is an area they will work on together through the year. He points out the power of the principal's body language, and shares how the principal's body language influenced the perceptions expressed by his team. He charges the principal to be intentional about his body

128

language and admits that he too is not always as intentional about his own body language as he would like to be—that he has the same struggle. He says this is something they can work on together. 11:24ES1T

r. The supt. ends the conference with clear next steps: when leading the team, increase wait time; help the academic team develop confidence in themselves. 11:24ES1T

s. The principal expresses in heartfelt tones, that he really appreciates that feedback. 11:24ES1T

t. The supt. announces that he is taking his coaching hat off, will be back in the next week or two to discuss this more, and wants to use the remaining 11 minutes to discuss some other topics. He asks about a staffing vacancy and praises the school's attendance and student satisfaction rates. He asks the principal to help lead the work on a survey they used, that he would like to use with the entire cluster. They discuss where the school is in its implementation of Response to Intervention. He asks about suspensions, and the school has none, so the supt. asks about how the school accomplished this. The principal explains his use of restorative justice, socio-emotional learning and in-school suspension. The Supt. asks if the principal can document that so that it can be shared. 11:24ES1T

u. When asked if there are any other areas to discuss, the principal mentions that he had a big meeting with his staff to attempt to convince them to come to him with concerns, but that he feels they are still keeping some concerns away from him. The supt. mentions having similar challenges with getting upward feedback. He models being reflective. 11:24ES1T

v. The principal offers his assistance in this area for the superintendent, and the superintendent offers to come to a faculty meeting to do a temperature check on mood for the principal and to offer feedback. 11:24ES1T

w. The supt. closes at 1:30 by sharing an article on leadership. 10:45ES1T

12:30 The superintendent heads back to Central Office for a district wide central office staff meeting.

Appendix E-PS2 Site Visit Notes

Shadowing Notes, District B Elementary Superintendent (Principal Supervisor) 2, School 1, September 10, 2015

10:58 a.m.

  d. The superintendent and principal meet in the principal's conference room. 10:58ES2C
  e. The supt. refers the principal to an agenda sent prior to the visit. The agenda includes 8 items: classroom walk-through; CSP update; ALT progress; Chancellor Goal Setting; RTI update; Personal Priorities; Supports/Opportunities for Feedback and Next steps/Close. Beside each item is the corresponding leadership framework standard that is used for principals' evaluations. Additionally, each component has several guiding questions and accountability artifacts. 10:58ES2C
  f. The superintendent begins by asking the principal how he is; then the two refer to the agenda. The principal says he sent replies to some of the questions on the agenda in advance. The superintendent proposes they visit classes. 10:58ES2C

11:03 a.m.

  a. The superintendent and principal visit the first classroom. All classes in this school are operated according to a specific educational philosophy that differs from traditional structures. Students are grouped by grade bands, rather than specific grades. In the lower grade band students are working in multiple groups. One group is learning how many quarts, pints and cups are in a gallon. Another group is working on journal entries. The superintendent visits different groups asking questions and taking notes. She asks, "Can you work together or just by yourself….how do you check your work (Students respond, "Sometimes by ourselves.")…how will you know if you got it right? (Student tries to explain then admits, "I don't even know what I'm trying to say.") 11:03ES2C
  b. In the hall, the superintendent asks the principal what he noticed. The principal shares that he noticed that the students weren't really clear about the purpose of the measurement activity, and that the case was the same with a fractions activity another group was attempting. He notices the students weren't really clear about what was expected. 11:03ES2C
  c. The superintendent agrees that in a particular group students were unclear about whether or not they should be writing multiple equivalent fractions or one. One student was writing multiple, and the rest were writing one. The principal affirms that he noticed that as well. He mentions that what was observed differs from the educational philosophy espoused by the school. 11:03ES2C

11:13

a. The superintendent and principal enter a second class. The supt. observes the instruction and takes notes. One group of students is completing a grammar packet. Another is working on compounds, prefixes and suffixes. A third group is working on factors. The principal observes and talks with students. 11:13ES2C

b. The two enter the hallway where the supt. again asks the principal what he noticed. The principal responds that he noticed a dependence on worksheets. The superintendent says she found that surprising. The principal says he thinks the teacher might be using worksheets to address weak areas for the students that can't be adequately addressed when using materials aligned to the school's educational philosophy; but agrees that he still found it surprising, and says that he doesn't typically find that in this teacher's classroom. 11:13ES2C

c. While transitioning to the next class, the superintendent asks the role of an instructional coach she noticed in the first classroom. The principal says she was observing, and the superintendent extends that she was observing the students complete packets. The principal says the coach had previously given a lesson and wanted to observe the follow- up to ensure the students understood. He plans to debrief with the coach and get her notes. 11:13ES2C

d. The next class is an upper level English/Language Arts class. The principal introduces the superintendent and observer. The teacher asks the students to explain what they are learning. Two students explain that the students are charged with writing about the American Revolution based on a blog. Students can pick any topic aligned with the American Revolution. 11:13ES2C

e. The superintendent asks a student what guidelines they were given for their essays. The student explains that they are to write about one of five points [topics] in their essays. The superintendent asks the student if they have a rubric. The student says, "No." The supt. asks, "How do you know what to do—how long it should be—how many paragraphs?" The student responds that it needs to be at least three paragraphs or as many as needed to fully describe and explain." 11:13ES2C

f. After leaving the class, the supt. confirms that the students in the class (approximately 14-20) are all of the students in that grade level in the school. The principal confirms it is, and says they are growing the school organically. He relates that it is difficult to find upper grade students who have experience with the school's educational philosophy. 11:13ES2C

g. The next class is an upper level math class. The principal talks with the teacher about "fivers" he requires students to complete. Students currently complete one per week, though the teacher says this may eventually increase to three per week. The fiver is a teacher created worksheet that contains five math questions. The principal recommends that the teacher consider integrating performance-level descriptors aligned to the PARCC (a common core assessment) into his "fivers." He shares that the coach will work with the teacher on this. The teacher appreciates this information and says it will help him reflect. 11:13ES2C

h. The superintendent asks how the content is organized, and the principal shares how different grade levels of students access different course material at this level. The superintendent asks what assessments are being used, and the principal shares they will take I-Ready assessments. The teacher says he will use "fivers" to gauge student progress toward standards. 11:13ES2C

i. The teacher opens this class explaining that some students will work with him, and other students will work on whichever fivers they choose. He further explains that if students have nothing else to do he will write problems for them on the spot. One student asks him to do this, so while his small group waits, he writes a math problem for the student to complete.

12:08

a. The supt. and principal return to the conference room to discuss the classroom visits. The supt. mentions that the principal has shared general observations throughout the visit, and again expresses her surprise at the abundance of worksheets in all classrooms. She mentions that normally she sees classes aligned to the school's educational philosophy but not Common Core or the district's units of study, and hypothesizes that perhaps teachers think they are satisfying the common core state standard expectations with all of the worksheets. She states that what she observed on this day does not seem to align with either the common core or the school's educational philosophy. She recalls examples of writing assignments from classes visited and states that she would like to see those types of writing assignments aligned to common core expectations. 12:08ES2C

b. She asks about the last math class visited. She asks if the content is limited to worksheets. The principal explains that the teacher provides small group instruction to two small groups. 12:08ES2C

c. The supt. shares that when she inquired of a student about what normally happens in the class, the student shared that the worksheet-based learning observed was usual. She models questioning the teacher about the rigor and shares that worksheets are not the best vehicle for rigorous instruction. She also notes the lack of manipulatives. 12:08ES2C

d. The principal explains how what was observed aligns with the school's educational philosophy and says he sent the teacher to training. He agrees that the superintendent's comments are valid and that the level of rigor needs to be raised. He says he will talk with the teacher and give him guidance. 12:08ES2C

e. The supt. reminds the principal that this conversation will be even more relevant when he sees his Beginning of Year assessment data. The principal mentions that the school has an achievement gap of over 50% in math. Students of one demographic score in the 70th percentile while students of another score in the 20th percentile. The superintendent reminds the principal that the assessment measures

the standards, and if the instruction doesn't match the standards, the students "won't stand a chance." 12:08ES2C

f. The supt. asks how the instructional coach works with the teachers on their planning. The principal explains that she works with specific groups of teachers for learning cycles. 12:08ES2C

g. The supt. states that the instructional coach should focus more on planning than observing instruction, since if teachers aren't planning for rigorous instruction, they will "miss the mark every time." The principal assents. 12:08ES2C

h. The supt. asks what the structures are for lesson plan review, and the principal shares that the instructional coach is attempting to help teachers align their lessons both with the school's educational philosophy and the district's units of study. He mentions that he has not seen her feedback on the lesson plans specifically yet, but has seen her debrief notes. He reflects that this is something he needs to start "sitting in on." 12:08ES2C

i. The supt. asks the principal what he can do to be more involved with lesson planning, review, and feedback. She thinks this may be beneficial especially if teachers have "pushback" since the coach is not an administrator. She says the first step is for teachers to see the need for change, but the second is using the resources in the building (principal, assistant principal and coach) to help with planning. She also says that once the principal looks at his beginning of year assessment data, he will need to determine additional next steps. She shares that there is a lot of opportunity for growth toward common core aligned instruction. 12:08ES2C

j. She states that it might be frustrating for observers to use the school's current common-core aligned informal observation tool until the planning needs are addressed. The supt. asks if there are any other thoughts related to the observation. The principal agrees with her direction. 12:08ES2C

k. The supt. asks if there are any new teachers. The principal describes two new teachers, and his plans to support them. He notes that one teacher is struggling with the alignment of the educational philosophy to the district's units of study. He says that this is difficult for teachers who come from other programs based on the chosen educational philosophy—especially private schools. 12:08ES2C

l. The principal shares that the school is attempting to grow its practice from solely focusing on structures aligned with the school's original model, to instruction that is aligned with the model's governing body's shift toward common core state standard alignment. 12:08ES2C

m. The supt. expresses that the next step in that journey is for the principal to hold teachers accountable for the desired shift through implementing systems, routines, and procedures—monitoring by sitting in on lesson planning, giving feedback on lesson plans, observing for proper implementation of what's in the plans, etc. 12:08ES2C

n. The supt. finishes this branch of the conversation by affirming that overall this school is "a happy place." She then shifts to the remaining items on her agenda. 12:08ES2C

o. They discuss the comprehensive school plan. The supt. asks for the three focus areas. The principal answers math, evidence based writing and pedagogical practices aligned to the school's educational philosophy. He discloses that the math focus area was chosen based on the 50 percent achievement gap between demographic groups in math. He shares three intervention programs the school is adopting. 12:08ES2C

p. The supt. inquires how the school chose the pedagogical practice focus area. The principal says that was chosen because it is a focus of the school. The supt. clarifies that focus areas should be based on challenge areas, and that implementation of the school's educational philosophy is actually one of the school's strengths. She reminds the principal to focus on a challenge area that will help the school overcome deficits in its student achievement. 12:08ES2C

q. She asks about the Academic Leadership Team. The principal shares that the team meets weekly and that he has sent her the agenda. He describes some of the work the Academic Leadership Team has done. He references recent training the school received on ALTs and how it has been relevant to their work. He recounts those who have been added to the team. The supt. recommends that the school use the resources from the training to help with alignment. 12:08ES2C

r. The supt. asks the principal to begin drafting chancellor goals, which she and her assigned principals discussed at a meeting the previous day. The principal shares that he has already drafted his goals and asks the supt. to provide feedback. He discusses specific reasons for choosing one of the goals related to student satisfaction. The supt. responds that she is comfortable with the student satisfaction goal. She also notes that he has three literacy goals and one math goal and suggests that since math is the school's target area, they should increase the math goals by one (and address the achievement gap) and decrease the literacy goals by one. She also recommends that one of the literacy goals be an evidenced based writing goal. 12:08ES2C

s. The supt. asks if the school will be represented at the Response to Intervention training the next day. The principal affirms that he will attend. 12:08ES2C

t. The supt. asks the principal to reflect on the visit, "What are your priorities based on our discussion today?" The principal says it is planning—determining alignment to the district's scope and sequence, giving feedback on lesson plans, and observing lessons. He wants to be very intentional and procedural. 12:08ES2C

u. The supt. asks what supports are needed. The principal first wants to talk with another principal whose school uses the same educational philosophy and who executes the practices he is interested in very well. The supt. agrees that the other principal is a good resource, and mentions that the students in that school show exceptional levels of success. When she asks if the principal has anything else, he

inquires about guided reading training. The supt. says she will work on it, and asks if the school will implement guided reading. The principal says they will because this is an area not addressed by the school's educational model. The supt. recommends the school consider having a levelled library. 12:08ES2C

The meeting ends at 12:57.

Appendix F-Middle School PS Site Visit Notes

Shadowing Notes, District B Middle School Superintendent (Principal Supervisor), August 17, 2015

9:11-

   a. The veteran principal of this middle school is hosting an introductory professional development with staff members. (9:11MSSH)
   b. The superintendent arrives during a team building exercise and sits in the back of the room. (9:11MSSH)
   c.   The superintendent shares that he is looking for how the school is using data, the leader's keynote message and how the school builds staff culture (i.e. district leadership, teacher leadership, etc.). (9:11MSSH)

9:20

   a. A teacher leader and an Assistant Principal share review data connected to the school's comprehensive school plan. They review scholastic reading inventory (SRI) data. They share that the SRI growth 13-14 was 62%; goal was 63%. The school achieved at 73%. Teachers applaud. They share I-ready progress for math-- baseline was 65%; goal was 70%; performance was 83%. Teachers applaud this as well. For writing, the goal was 70%. They ended the school year at 77.3%. Truancy was at 60% four years ago. In 2012- 43%, 2013-23%, 18% last year and 8.9% for 14-15. An AP explains what this means to a querulous teacher. For the last goal (kids liking school) in 12-13 it was 56%, to 70% in 13-14, and 14-15 performance was 78%. The school missed the goal of 80% by 2 percentage points. Teachers query about the current year's goals. The AP focuses the teachers on celebrating the previous year's success. (9:20MSSH)

9:25

   a. The staff takes a break. The principal lets teachers know how to pick up their supplies. The staff thunders their applause. (9:25MSSH)
   b. During the break, the superintendent warmly greets staff members by name. He celebrates the staff tee-shirt asking a staff member to show off hers. He says the shirt is hilarious and that he also has one. (9:25MSSH)
   c.   He mentions that he showed off his shirt at another school that was having discussions about data, to illustrate his point to that school that making gains is associated with doing things with fidelity. (9:25MSSH)
   d.   He points out a teacher who has moved to this school from one of his other middle schools. He then greets another staff member by name. The staff member expresses that he hopes the Superintendent remains in his current position. He

expresses a desire for stability since most superintendents he has experienced leave the position after a year. (9:25MSSH)

e. The supt. queries about changes to the in-school suspension program. (9:25MSSH)
f. He talks with the teacher who transitioned from another school. (9:25MSSH)
g. The supt. expresses that he wishes he had realized that this was the first day of school when he received the invitation for a central office meeting to which he committed. (9:25MSSH)
h. The Dean of the school stops by and the Superintendent greets him by name. They discuss a mutual interest in baseball paraphernalia. Another teacher comes over to talk to the superintendent as well. The teacher shares his teaching assignment, and the superintendent asks him about whether he worked on a district initiative. Another teacher arrives and expresses delight in her schedule. The superintendent celebrates with her and shows interest in her schedule. (9:25MSSH)
i. He also shares information about a district partnership with a local university that he is leading related to her subject. (9:25MSSH)

9:35

a. The PD resumes with the principal sharing her goal for her session. She plans to discuss school climate and culture, socio-emotional learning, attendance, scheduling, discipline, grades and academics. She shares that her goal is to stay at the "30, 000 foot level." (9:35MSSH)
b. Each initiative has an accompanying slide. Many of the school priorities captured in the slides are closely linked to the focus areas the superintendents and principals decided on in a previous meeting. (9:35MSSH)
c. In her session, the principal does some turning and talking with the staff for 30 seconds. She then walks the faculty through several slides (related to climate and culture, socio-emotional learning, attendance, scheduling, discipline, grades and academics). Each slide has two sections: past and present, and on each slide the first section has several bullets. The "present" section of each slide has between one and six bullets. On the first slide (socio-emotional learning) for instance, the principal talks through their past efforts (related to developmental design, kid talk, systems of care, and 3,4,5 support providence. In the future (same slide) she talks staff through the following: Going Forward, Restorative Justice, peer mediation, Sparks, CBITS, and the Discipline Committee. The principal talks the staff through research that grounds the school's efforts. She also discusses how the school's efforts have evolved over time. (9:35MSSH)
d. The superintendent expresses to the observer his admiration for the fidelity the school has demonstrated to the articulated initiatives. He indicates that he wants to compliment the principal on that. (9:35MSSH)
e. The superintendent notes that he wants to give the principal feedback on her progress toward her goal of staying at the 30,000 foot level. He suggests that the presentation observed contains a robust amount of information. Her coverage of

this slide takes eight minutes.   He wonders whether this aligns with the principal's articulated goal. (9:35MSSH)

   f.   In her coverage of the first slide, the principal solicits staff members to give testimonials related to the slide's topics. The principal presents the six slides she has prepared for one hour and seven minutes. (9:35MSSH)

   g.   The superintendent muses on whether the staff members are processing all of the initiatives described, given that it is their first day back in the building. He expresses that based on his observation, he would like to explore with the principal whether or not there are ways to make the information presented more digestible for staff. (9:35MSSH)

   h.   The superintendent expresses that it is his personal goal to debrief more with principals onsite, so that whatever written feedback they receive is first communicated in person. (9:35MSSH)

11:00

   a.   At 11:00, the superintendent meets with the principal for a planned 15 minutes of debriefing. (11:00MSSH)

   b.   He compliments her on her school's high fidelity on proven initiatives, and on the results this has produced for the principal's school. The superintendent also celebrates the principal's clear agenda, high level of preparation and positive feedback to her staff. He shares that there are no huge concerns, and that he wants to collaborate on next steps. (11:00MSSH)

   c.   He questions the principal, "How did you think the day went?" The principal reflects on the day and mentions that she wanted to not impinge on the presentations of some of her other staff. She mentions that the school is celebrating the gains, but has work to do (which will be covered more on Friday). The principal expresses her desire to "lead from behind." She mentions she wanted her presentation to be interactive, which is why she integrated turn and talk, skits, videos, testimonials, etc. (11:00MSSH)

   d.   The supt. asks, "What did you want them to take away from your presentation?" The principal shares her goal for staff to focus on pleasure reading in addition to complex reading, Hochmann writing and blended learning.

   e.   She asks the supt. "Did you get that take away?" (11:00MSSH) He responds, "Yes and No—It was definitely in there." He reflects on 30,000 feet and says he thinks differently about that. He asks the principal what she meant by that. The principal clarifies that she doesn't intend to go into logistics and details, and says you can't motivate people by talking. (11:00MSSH)

   f.   The supt. shares that for him 30,000 is different than the session observed. He challenges the principal to think about how a ½ hour presentation would be different, and (11:00MSSH)

g.   models how the elements the principal covered would sound if they were aligned with his idea of a 30,000 foot level. He models various paths to the principal's goals. (11:00MSSH)

h.   He questions the principal, "What do you want teachers to do as a result of the presentation?" The principal responds that she wants to reduce push back by sharing "the why" with teachers. (11:00MSSH)

i.   The supt. asks the principal how she knows that her objective was met. The principal says she gets much of her feedback anecdotally. The superintendent pushes the principal to collect more empirical feedback. (11:00MSSH)

j.   The superintendent once again commends the principal on the good things he saw, (11:00MSSH)

k.   and tells a story on how he has discussed the best practices used by this school at another. (11:00MSSH)

l.   He sums up that the only item he wants the principal to think differently about is concise representations of the "30,000 foot level"—30 rather than 90. He also challenges the principal to gather empirical evidence in addition to anecdotal feedback. (11:00MSSH)

m.   The principal shows remarkable receptivity to this feedback and muses on what she could do differently almost immediately. (11:00MSSH)

n.   The supt. compliments the leadership of the principal and how she has built the leadership of her staff. He also compliments her on modelling high quality instruction, and commends what he saw as a "Great start to the year." (11:00MSSH)

o.   When the principal mentions that she wants to align her work with district personnel, the superintendent volunteers to arrange a norming visit with those district personnel. (11:00MSSH)

p.   The visit ends at 11:25. (11:00MSSH)

11:25-1:30 Evaluation norming

a.   The superintendent from there drives to the Central Office for a meeting with high level leaders in the organization regarding end-of-year evaluations. (11:25MSCO)

b.   During this meeting, the superintendent is asked to reflect on the context individual leaders in his cluster (group of schools) provided for their evaluations. (11:25MSCO)

1:30-2:30 Interview

a.   During this segment of his day, the superintendent meets with the researcher to participate in his interview related to the demands of his position. (1:30MSCO)

2:45 Transition to School Number 2

a.   At 2:45 the superintendent drives to his second school, where he observes a new principal conduct a professional development session and facilitate an Academic Leadership Team meeting. (2:45MSKM)

At 3:30

    a. The superintendent walks into the final minutes of the principal's closing of his professional development session and is cheerfully greeted by staff whose names he knows and who appear comfortable with him--joking and asking questions. (3:30MSKM)

    b. The new principal asks staff for feedback on how the day went (1-2 things that went well, and 1-2 things they would change). (3:30MSKM)

    c. He then invites all staff to stay for the Academic Leadership Team in addition to those required to stay. (3:30MSKM)

    d. The superintendent takes notes on what he observes through an email that he will later send to himself. (3:30MSKM)

3:45

    a. The principal begins the meeting by facilitating consensus around group norms.   He then shares data regarding testing participation rates, and leads the group through a discussion of which testing option to use in order to increase participation rates to 95%. (3:45MSKM)

    b. The conversation lasts 25 minutes, during which various team members express their thoughts for and against each option. One team member asks if a third option can be considered and the principal allows the team to discuss what a third option could be. (3:45MSKM)

    c.   When asked for his opinion the supt. expresses that the decision rests with the team, but that they should examine both options through the lens of teachers, testing coordinators and students. (3:45MSKM)

    d. The group tables a final decision for another time. (3:45MSKM)

4:05

    a. The principal disseminates an article on the work of academic (instructional) leadership teams. After reading it silently, all members are asked to brainstorm expectations, and non-expectations for the work of their team in connection with the article. Examples of expectations include reflection, sharing a vision, professional learning focus, must be aligned, model cultural norms, develop emerging leaders, looks at student data, and clear communications. Examples of non-expectations generated include a focus on anything not related to professional learning, no pre-requisite skills needed. (4:05MSKM)

    b. During the visit, the superintendent takes notes via an email that he will later send to himself. (4:05MSKM)

    c.   The conversation closes with the group wondering if all team members are ready to coach teachers instructionally, and whether or not the staff is ready to accept coaching. (4:05MSKM)

4:15

a. The principal disseminates an observation tool with connected materials and asks the team for feedback. He goes around the room to solicit feedback and the superintendent asks how the tool aligns with common core standards (which is what the principal has expressed as his goal). (4:15MSKM)

b. The superintendent muses that this would have been a good topic for use with the earlier protocol and mentions he will reflect with the principal on that. He also shares that he thinks the goal of the testing conversation might have been to establish a culture of collaboration but he will ask the principal for more information on that. He wonders if one of the more adaptive instructional pieces (observation and/or ALT design) might have worked even better for that. (4:15MSKM)

4:47

a. After the ALT meeting ends, the principal meets with his two assistant principals to debrief the day. He asks for evidence that the objectives of the day were met. The focus areas of the day were team building, mission construction, clarification of expectations, vision articulation, data analysis, departmental goal setting and grade level planning. Assistant principals provide the requested evidence (post-it notes, teacher reflections, etc.). The debriefing reveals that outcomes were met. (4:47MSKM)

b. The principal facilitates a debrief on the Academic Leadership Team meeting, and asks if the superintendent would like to give any feedback. (4:47MSKM)

c. The superintendent shares that he did not see how the Common Core actions are explicitly linked to the informal observation tool presented to the team. The superintendent also mentions that he is surprised the Academic Leadership Team did not push back more on the common core aligned informal observation tool, since it is a new tool. (4:47MSKM)

d. While the principal continues debriefing with his team, the superintendent walks the classroom reading the teacher feedback posted on the walls. (4:47MSKM)

5:09

a. At 5:09, the principal asks the superintendent if he has any feedback to share. (5:09MSKM)

b. The superintendent meets briefly with the principal to discuss his observations. He compliments the principal on soliciting feedback and on helping teachers to know what they don't know. He also shares that he liked the ALT structure—it was concise, crisp and the principal got through a lot. He praises that all team members participated in some elements of the meeting. He also offers accolades on the content of the PD. (5:09MSKM)

c. He asks the principal how he felt about the day, to which the principal responds he would like more time to think, but that it went pretty well—was a good start. (5:09MSKM)

d. He asks the principal about the roles and positions of specific staff. He asks the principal why he invited the conversation about the testing options 1-3. As the supt. predicted, the principal wanted to allow the staff to make a choice.

e. The superintendent further queries why the principal chose to devote that amount of time to a fairly technical topic vs. the more adaptive topics of the observation tool or the ALT foci. The principal admits it was easier. When the supt. challenges the principal, "You don't do easy" the principal further explains that he was more adamant that the instructional tool happen as written. (5:09MSKM)

f. The superintendent agrees with the principal that it is important to allow the team to "debate something" and to have their voices heard. He agrees that shared understanding is good and compliments the Assistant Principal's facilitation of a portion of the meeting. (5:09MSKM)

g. The superintendent models a way to limit the discussion of the testing options in order to give more time/depth to the discussion of the observation tool. (5:09MSKM)

h. He coaches the principal that he would prefer to see the ALT spend more time on adaptive areas more deeply connected to instructional leadership and instructional conversations. When the principal reiterates that he wanted to make sure there was limited debate on the observation tool, the superintendent clarifies that he would like to see loosened (but structured) parameters on the instructional stuff and tighter parameters on "the technical stuff." (5:09MSKM)

i. He compliments the principal again on inviting so many team members to the table and for quieting his own voice so that the voices of other team members can be heard. (5:09MSKM)

j. The superintendent asks the principal for his take-aways. The principal shares the following:
    4. Move them (the ALT) to conversations about instruction and keep them there.
    5. Make certain to focus on the adaptive (related to instruction) rather than the technical.
    6. Set parameters on technical and loosen parameters on instructional. The superintendent clarifies that it is still good to have parameters on instruction. (5:09MSKM)

k. The superintendent reiterates that there is a "long list of really good things that the principal should keep doing." (5:09MSKM)

l. He mentions that he will be sharing the PD evaluation strategies this principal used with his staff with another principal. (5:09MSKM)

m. He then compliments the principal on a particular phrase he used with his staff earlier in the day. The principal invites the superintendent to drop by whenever he wants. (5:09MSKM)

n. The session ends at 5:30 p.m. (5:09MSKM)

Appendix G-High School PS Site Visit Notes

Shadowing Notes, District B Middle School Superintendent (Principal Supervisor), August 17, 2015

9:11-

d. The veteran principal of this middle school is hosting an introductory professional development with staff members. (9:11MSSH)

e. The superintendent arrives during a team building exercise and sits in the back of the room. (9:11MSSH)

f. The superintendent shares that he is looking for how the school is using data, the leader's keynote message and how the school builds staff culture (i.e. district leadership, teacher leadership, etc.). (9:11MSSH)

9:20

b. A teacher leader and an Assistant Principal share review data connected to the school's comprehensive school plan. They review scholastic reading inventory (SRI) data. They share that the SRI growth 13-14 was 62%; goal was 63%. The school achieved at 73%. Teachers applaud. They share I-ready progress for math-- baseline was 65%; goal was 70%; performance was 83%. Teachers applaud this as well. For writing, the goal was 70%. They ended the school year at 77.3%. Truancy was at 60% four years ago. In 2012- 43%, 2013-23%, 18% last year and 8.9% for 14- 15. An AP explains what this means to a querulous teacher. For the last goal (kids liking school) in 12-13 it was 56%, to 70% in 13-14, and 14-15 performance was 78%. The school missed the goal of 80% by 2 percentage points. Teachers query about the current year's goals. The AP focuses the teachers on celebrating the previous year's success. (9:20MSSH)

9:25

j. The staff takes a break. The principal lets teachers know how to pick up their supplies. The staff thunders their applause. (9:25MSSH)

k. During the break, the superintendent warmly greets staff members by name. He celebrates the staff tee-shirt asking a staff member to show off hers. He says the shirt is hilarious and that he also has one. (9:25MSSH)

l. He mentions that he showed off his shirt at another school that was having discussions about data, to illustrate his point to that school that making gains is associated with doing things with fidelity. (9:25MSSH)

m. He points out a teacher who has moved to this school from one of his other middle schools. He then greets another staff member by name. The staff member expresses that he hopes the Superintendentremains in his current position. He expresses a desire for stability since most superintendents he has experienced leave the position after a year. (9:25MSSH)

n. The supt. queries about changes to the in-school suspension program. (9:25MSSH)

o. He talks with the teacher who transitioned from another school. (9:25MSSH)

p. The supt. expresses that he wishes he had realized that this was the first day of school when he received the invitation for a central office meeting to which he committed. (9:25MSSH)

q. The Dean of the school stops by and the Superintendent greets him by name. They discuss a mutual interest in baseball paraphernalia. Another teacher comes over to talk to the superintendent as well. The teacher shares his teaching assignment, and the superintendent asks him about whether he worked on a district initiative. Another teacher arrives and expresses delight in her schedule. The superintendent celebrates with her and shows interest in her schedule. (9:25MSSH)

r. He also shares information about a district partnership with a local university that he is leading related to her subject. (9:25MSSH)

9:35

i. The PD resumes with the principal sharing her goal for her session. She plans to discuss school climate and culture, socio-emotional learning, attendance, scheduling, discipline, grades and academics. She shares that her goal is to stay at the "30, 000 foot level." (9:35MSSH)

j. Each initiative has an accompanying slide. Many of the school priorities captured in the slides are closely linked to the focus areas the superintendents and principals decided on in a previous meeting. (9:35MSSH)

k. In her session, the principal does some turning and talking with the staff for 30 seconds. She then walks the faculty through several slides (related to climate and culture, socio-emotional learning, attendance, scheduling, discipline, grades and academics). Each slide has two sections: past and present, and on each slide the first section has several bullets. The "present" section of each slide has between one and six bullets. On the first slide (socio-emotional learning) for instance, the principal talks through their past efforts (related to developmental design, kid talk, systems of care, and 3,4,5 support providence. In the future (same slide) she talks staff through the following: Going Forward, Restorative Justice, peer mediation, Sparks, CBITS, and the Discipline Committee. The principal talks the staff through research that grounds the school's efforts. She also discusses how the school's efforts have evolved over time. (9:35MSSH)

l. The superintendent expresses to the observer his admiration for the fidelity the school has demonstrated to the articulated initiatives. He indicates that he wants to compliment the principal on that. (9:35MSSH)

m. The superintendent notes that he wants to give the principal feedback on her progress toward her goal of staying at the 30,000 foot level. He suggests that the presentation observed contains a robust amount of information. Her coverage of this slide takes eight minutes. He wonders whether this aligns with the principal's articulated goal. (9:35MSSH)

n. In her coverage of the first slide, the principal solicits staff members to give testimonials related to the slide's topics. The principal presents the six slides she has prepared for one hour and seven minutes. (9:35MSSH)

o. The superintendent muses on whether the staff members are processing all of the initiatives described, given that it is their first day back in the building. He expresses that based on his observation, he would like to explore with the principal whether or not there are ways to make the information presented more digestible for staff. (9:35MSSH)

p. The superintendent expresses that it is his personal goal to debrief more with principals onsite, so that whatever written feedback they receive is first communicated in person. (9:35MSSH)

11:00

q. At 11:00, the superintendent meets with the principal for a planned 15 minutes of debriefing. (11:00MSSH)

r. He compliments her on her school's high fidelity on proven initiatives, and on the results this has produced for the principal's school. The superintendent also celebrates the principal's clear agenda, high level of preparation and positive feedback to her staff. He shares that there are no huge concerns, and that he wants to collaborate on next steps. (11:00MSSH)

s. He questions the principal, "How did you think the day went?" The principal reflects on the day and mentions that she wanted to not impinge on the presentations of some of her other staff. She mentions that the school is celebrating the gains, but has work to do (which will be covered more on Friday). The principal expresses her desire to "lead from behind." She mentions she wanted her presentation to be interactive, which is why she integrated turn and talk, skits, videos, testimonials, etc. (11:00MSSH)

t. The supt. asks, "What did you want them to take away from your presentation?" The principal shares her goal for staff to focus on pleasure reading in addition to complex reading, Hochmann writing and blended learning.

u. She asks the supt. "Did you get that take away?" (11:00MSSH) He responds, "Yes and No—It was definitely in there." He reflects on 30,000 feet and says he thinks differently about that. He asks the principal what she meant by that. The principal clarifies that she doesn't intend to go into logistics and details, and says you can't motivate people by talking. (11:00MSSH)

v. The supt. shares that for him 30,000 is different than the session observed. He challenges the principal to think about how a ½ hour presentation would be different, and (11:00MSSH)

w. models how the elements the principal covered would sound if they were aligned with his idea of a 30,000 foot level. He models various paths to the principal's goals. (11:00MSSH)

x. He questions the principal, "What do you want teachers to do as a result of the presentation?" The principal responds that she wants to reduce push back by sharing "the why" with teachers. (11:00MSSH)

y. The supt. asks the principal how she knows that her objective was met. The principal says she gets much of her feedback anecdotally. The superintendent pushes the principal to collect more empirical feedback. (11:00MSSH)

z. The superintendent once again commends the principal on the good things he saw, (11:00MSSH)

aa. and tells a story on how he has discussed the best practices used by this school at another. (11:00MSSH)

bb. He sums up that the only item he wants the principal to think differently about is concise representations of the "30,000 foot level"—30 rather than 90. He also challenges the principal to gather empirical evidence in addition to anecdotal feedback. (11:00MSSH)

cc. The principal shows remarkable receptivity to this feedback and muses on what she could do differently almost immediately. (11:00MSSH)

dd. The supt. compliments the leadership of the principal and how she has built the leadership of her staff. He also compliments her on modelling high quality instruction, and commends what he saw as a "Great start to the year." (11:00MSSH)

ee. When the principal mentions that she wants to align her work with district personnel, the superintendent volunteers to arrange a norming visit with those district personnel. (11:00MSSH)

ff. The visit ends at 11:25. (11:00MSSH)

11:25-1:30 Evaluation norming

c. The superintendent from there drives to the Central Office for a meeting with high level leaders in the organization regarding end-of-year evaluations. (11:25MSCO)

d. During this meeting, the superintendent is asked to reflect on the context individual leaders in his cluster (group of schools) provided for their evaluations. (11:25MSCO)

1:30-2:30 Interview

b. During this segment of his day, the superintendent meets with the researcher to participate in his interview related to the demands of his position. (1:30MSCO)

2:45 Transition to School Number 2

b. At 2:45 the superintendent drives to his second school, where he observes a new principal conduct a professional development session and facilitate an Academic Leadership Team meeting. (2:45MSKM)

At 3:30

e. The superintendent walks into the final minutes of the principal's closing of his professional development session and is cheerfully greeted by staff whose names he knows and who appear comfortable with him--joking and asking questions. (3:30MSKM)

f. The new principal asks staff for feedback on how the day went (1-2 things that went well, and 1-2 things they would change). (3:30MSKM)

g. He then invites all staff to stay for the Academic Leadership Team in addition to those required to stay. (3:30MSKM)

h. The superintendent takes notes on what he observes through an email that he will later send to himself. (3:30MSKM)

3:45

e. The principal begins the meeting by facilitating consensus around group norms. He then shares data regarding testing participation rates, and leads the group through a discussion of which testing option to use in order to increase participation rates to 95%. (3:45MSKM)

f. The conversation lasts 25 minutes, during which various team members express their thoughts for and against each option. One team member asks if a third option can be considered and the principal allows the team to discuss what a third option could be. (3:45MSKM)

g. When asked for his opinion the supt. expresses that the decision rests with the team, but that they should examine both options through the lens of teachers, testing coordinators and students. (3:45MSKM)

h. The group tables a final decision for another time. (3:45MSKM)

4:05

d. The principal disseminates an article on the work of academic (instructional) leadership teams. After reading it silently, all members are asked to brainstorm expectations, and non-expectations for the work of their team in connection with the article. Examples of expectations include reflection, sharing a vision, professional learning focus, must be aligned, model cultural norms, develop emerging leaders, looks at student data, and clear communications. Examples of non-expectations generated include a focus on anything not related to professional learning, no pre-requisite skills needed. (4:05MSKM)

e. During the visit, the superintendent takes notes via an email that he will later send to himself. (4:05MSKM)

f. The conversation closes with the group wondering if all team members are ready to coach teachers instructionally, and whether or not the staff is ready to accept coaching. (4:05MSKM)

4:15

c. The principal disseminates an observation tool with connected materials and asks the team for feedback. He goes around the room to solicit feedback and the superintendent asks how the tool aligns with common core standards (which is what the principal has expressed as his goal). (4:15MSKM)

d. The superintendent muses that this would have been a good topic for use with the earlier protocol and mentions he will reflect with the principal on that. He also shares that he thinks the goal of the testing conversation might have been to establish a culture of collaboration but he will ask the principal for more information on that. He wonders if one of the more adaptive instructional pieces (observation and/or ALT design) might have worked even better for that. (4:15MSKM)

4:47

e. After the ALT meeting ends, the principal meets with his two assistant principals to debrief the day. He asks for evidence that the objectives of the day were met. The focus areas of the day were team building, mission construction, clarification of expectations, vision articulation, data analysis, departmental goal setting and grade level planning. Assistant principals provide the requested evidence (post-it notes, teacher reflections, etc.). The debriefing reveals that outcomes were met. (4:47MSKM)

f. The principal facilitates a debrief on the Academic Leadership Team meeting, and asks if the superintendent would like to give any feedback. (4:47MSKM)

g. The superintendent shares that he did not see how the Common Core actions are explicitly linked to the informal observation tool presented to the team. The superintendent also mentions that he is surprised the Academic Leadership Team did not push back more on the common core aligned informal observation tool, since it is a new tool. (4:47MSKM)

h. While the principal continues debriefing with his team, the superintendent walks the classroom reading the teacher feedback posted on the walls. (4:47MSKM)

5:09

o. At 5:09, the principal asks the superintendent if he has any feedback to share. (5:09MSKM)

p. The superintendent meets briefly with the principal to discuss his observations. He compliments the principal on soliciting feedback and on helping teachers to know what they don't know. He also shares that he liked the ALT structure—it was concise, crisp and the principal got through a lot. He praises that all team members participated in some elements of the meeting. He also offers accolades on the content of the PD. (5:09MSKM)

q. He asks the principal how he felt about the day, to which the principal responds he would like more time to think, but that it went pretty well—was a good start. (5:09MSKM)

r. He asks the principal about the roles and positions of specific staff. He asks the principal why he invited the conversation about the testing options 1-3. As the supt. predicted, the principal wanted to allow the staff to make a choice.

s. The superintendent further queries why the principal chose to devote that amount of time to a fairly technical topic vs. the more adaptive topics of the observation tool or the ALT foci. The principal admits it was easier. When the supt. challenges the principal, "You don't do easy" the principal further explains that he was more adamant that the instructional tool happen as written. (5:09MSKM)

t. The superintendent agrees with the principal that it is important to allow the team to "debate something" and to have their voices heard. He agrees that shared understanding is good and compliments the Assistant Principal's facilitation of a portion of the meeting. (5:09MSKM)

u. The superintendent models a way to limit the discussion of the testing options in order to give more time/depth to the discussion of the observation tool. (5:09MSKM)

v. He coaches the principal that he would prefer to see the ALT spend more time on adaptive areas more deeply connected to instructional leadership and instructional conversations. When the principal reiterates that he wanted to make sure there was limited debate on the observation tool, the superintendent clarifies that he would like to see loosened (but structured) parameters on the instructional stuff and tighter parameters on "the technical stuff." (5:09MSKM)

w. He compliments the principal again on inviting so many team members to the table and for quieting his own voice so that the voices of other team members can be heard. (5:09MSKM)

x. The superintendent asks the principal for his take-aways. The principal shares the following:
   7. Move them (the ALT) to conversations about instruction and keep them there.
   8. Make certain to focus on the adaptive (related to instruction) rather than the technical.
   9. Set parameters on technical and loosen parameters on instructional. The superintendent clarifies that it is still good to have parameters on instruction. (5:09MSKM)

y. The superintendent reiterates that there is a "long list of really good things that the principal should keep doing." (5:09MSKM)

z. He mentions that he will be sharing the PD evaluation strategies this principal used with his staff with another principal. (5:09MSKM)

aa. He then compliments the principal on a particular phrase he used with his staff earlier in the day. The principal invites the superintendent to drop by whenever he wants. (5:09MSKM)

bb. The session ends at 5:30 p.m. (5:09MSKM)

Appendix H-Raw Notes on Interview Responses of Elementary Principal Supervisors

Interview Questions	ES1 Response	ES2 Response
1-Background	4th/5th grade teacher	Taught 3-5 all subjects
	Mentored by principal	Coached tchrs in instr. NBCT
	Aftercare coord.	Principal and AP
	MA in Admin	Curriculum Director
	AP	Passionate about hq instr.
	Principal with accolades	Always an instr. Ldr.
2-Background-Useful PD Recvd.	BA-History	Had to lead through switch to value added eval. System
	MA in Admin	Had to learn cc instru.
	EML-Leadership	BA-Elem Ed.
	Trial and Error	MA-Curr. And Instr.
		Doctorate in Curr. And Instru.
		Supt. shadowing/Mentoring and support
3-Additional PD needed for PS	Residencies for principals	Dealing with skill gaps
	Blended Coaching	Differentiating support for ldrs. With significant gaps
	Supt. Shadowing	How to have difficult conversations
4-Educational Philosophy	Education is the way to go	Ron Edmund-We know what it takes to have successful schools
	Children of color can't be successful without educ.	We need to deal with inequalities
	Life is about options. Educ. Gives st. options.	Need for equality in education
5 a-Time Spent on Instruction	The right amount	The right amount
	3 1/2 hours each visit	In schools all available days
	Majority of my time	Not sacrificing instruction
5 b- Time Spent Talent	The right amount	More than I planned

	Understanding how the principal views talent	Peaks (in the summer) and valleys
	Observing talent to compare perspectives	Unexpectedly hired if princ./Aps vacant
	Observing the Leadership Team for interactions	Collect info feeding into princ evals.
5C-Time spent on School Culture	Less than planned/wanted	The right amount-Not a lot
	Believes great instruction will lead to great culture	3 schools needed support; not a heavy lift
	Some schools have cultures that don't need to be touched	Exception is RTI-a lot of time here-right amount
5D-Time spent on Operations	Little to None-Not really a Lot	None at all-Don't spend much time on that
	Master schedule was submitted in summer	Most princ. Have people to do this for them
	Can fit operations into the school walk	Does not directly tie to moving st. Achmt.
	Not much focus on budget right now	Operations Spec. does this
	Only so much you can say about enrollment	
5E-Time Spent on Family/Comm.	Little to None	Little to None-not happy about that
	Not the focus right now	Ask for parent letters but don't give fdbk.
	Agenda includes 16 items-only one is family/comm.	Not a priority, but is important
5F-Time spent on pers. Ldrshp.	The right amount-	Less than planned
	Everything discussed is under personal ldrshp.	Run out of time
	Provides access pt.for coaching	Would like to use the 360 survey here
6A-Time spent	Little to None-	The right amount-Peaks and

brokering		valleys
	Not beneficial to connect to central office	During budget season I clear my calendar
	More beneficial to connect principal to eachother	During staffing season, you spend a lot of time on this-summer
		Samewith enrollment
6B-Time Spent Modelling	Little to None	Less than I would want
	Principals are high quality	So much to cover in meetings-something is sacrificed
	Instead asks probing questions	Do this in one on one mtgs. Give ex. And practice
6C-Time spent on Diff. Assist.	The right amount-All the time	The right amount-happens naturally
	Follows a scripted agenda	six princ. Are highly effective
	Varies the time allotted to agenda items	For them convos look and feel different
6D-Time spent dev/using tools	The right amount	The right amount
	Observations tools aligned to common core	Share openly in the cluster
	Pushes principal for theirs and shares	I always send resources
	ALT agendas, etc.	
6E-Engaging princ. As resources for eachother	The right amount-all the time	Less than I planned-could do more
	Principals know more than he does	Try to structure cluster mtgs. For this, but once a month is not enough
	He was a principal at a different time.	Princ. Should be talking and sharing best pract. More
7. Items on your to-do list	Comprehensive School Plan	Reviewing RTI plans and giving fdbk
	Conversations around evidence	Reviewing CSP's and giving fdbk
	Getting to Academic	Reviewing chanc., AP and

	Leadership Team meetings	TAS goals for alignment
	Formal walk-throughs	
	Grade level collab. Observations.	
8. Enjoy most about being a PS?	Knowing schools are on the right track	Team/Colleagues/Networking
	Happy staff/students; good/happy principals	Principals
	Helping people grow/getting right people	Ideal position
9-What should be re-examined	Structure for dealing with parents	Parent concerns should be different camp
	Need to define IS role	Logistical needs
	Other things (not instr related) should go elsewhere	transportation, staff, budget, office
	Hire other central office people for oper/family/comm.	
10-What else should I know?	Hard to get into schools as much as wanted	40 40 schools need models and flexibility
	Need to decrease span of control to 6-10	
	Team is fantastic	
11. How was your time spent?		
Hours in schools	23.5-school visits, ALT mtgs.	20 hours-school visits
Hours in other school support	21-Meetings, Supt PD, BTS nites	14 hours-Supt/princ. PD; central ofc. Mtg.s
Other prof. time uses		3 hours at home on emails/writing bulletins
12. Anything else?	Take parent engagements and operations off of principal plates	Working on shifting perceptions of IS functions

Interview Questions	MS Respose	HS response
1-Background	Taught HS SS	HS SS tchr. In Baltimore
	AP in 6-12 school	Mentored by principal
	Principal -success in two schools	Did instr. Focused tchr. Obs.
		Dept. Chair
		Principal
		New Leaders
2-Background-Useful PD Recvd.	Grad. Course on dynamics and tmbldg.	Deputy Chief mentoring
	The Skillful Teacher	The Breakthrough Coach
	Gates alternative school network-school designs and structures	Rick DuFour-PLC trng.
	Exposure and experience	Doctorate in Entrepreneurial leadership in ED.
	Blended Coaching	Bachelor's Social Sci/Sec Ed.
		Master's in Ed. Admin.
3-Additional PD needed for PS	Blended Coaching	Blended Coaching
	More PD on content and assessments	Managing instru. Walks
		Delivering PD
4-Educational Philosophy	Education as an act of social justice	All kids can achieve and learn at high levels
	Children should do cognitive lift	Intelligence is not innate
	If I'm doing it for you, I'm doing you a disservice.	With hard work and effort, and really great teaching, we can close achievement gaps.
	Default ldrshp style is collaborative-suggestive, not directive	
5 a-Time Spent on Instruction	The right amount-	The right amount last week
	Includes school time and instr. Central office mtgs.	Usually less than I planned
	Look at data and instru. Goals, admin tm. Mtgs.,	Don't get into data convos as much as I would like

	observing pd, etc.	
5 b- Time Spent Talent	The right amount-not very much	The right amount
	Helped principals fill vacancies	
	Also includes looking at their evals of others	
	Also includes how I evaluate them	
5C-Time spent on School Culture	Less than I wanted to	More than I planned last week
	Wanted to go into culture plng. Mtgs.	Have to differentiate
	Want to really go through [those plans]	Aren't enough hours in the day to do it all.
		-40-40 more than planned; Little to none in other schools
5D-Time spent on Operations	The right amount-little to none	More than I planned
	electric bill, elevator, scheduling	Pushing back wk on other offices
	Forward to various offices	Susp, parent calls, principal responses
		Should be 10% but sometimes longer
5E-Time Spent on Family/Comm.	Little to none	The right amount-not a lot
	During the school year, track 5-6 convos	80% should be instruction; 20% other stuff like this
	Typically they get resolved without me.	3 dates per school; 33 proactive interactions
		Maybe too much when parent concerns are factored in
5F-Time spent on pers. Ldrshp.	The right amount-last week more than usual, which was planned	Less than I planned/should
	Had to have tough convos with vet. Princ.	Tend to push when something is not right
	Gave some fdbk to a dean	Want to sit down and focus more

	and AP	proactively on this.
		Want to redirect for them to provide rationales rather than asking my opinion.
6A-Time spent brokering	The right amount	Little to none-don't plan to connect them
	Building into routines, inviting them to cluster mtgs.	Only in response to need- just a little
	For operations stuff, I stay out of it	
6B-Time Spent Modelling	Less than I should have-- didn't plan much	More time than I planned
	Maybe I need to model more--lead some sessions or role play	I need to let principals take the lead more
	I was very intentional at my last cluster mtg-modelled agenda creation	Trying to use a protocol to force that
6C-Time spent on Diff. Assist.	Right amount-Maybe I could spend a little more time.	the right amount-could do more but only so many hours in the day
	Tries to spend more time with new principals	enrollment, shifting teacher practice
	Evaluates time spent with new principals in his head	More time with new principals
6D-Time spent dev/using tools	A little less than I planned	More than I planned
	Want to create resources to go with cluster themes	Always sending articles/instruments
	Would like to spend more time on that.	UBD resources, website with unit/lesson plans
6E-Engaging princ. As resources for eachother	Less than I planned-I should do more; Didn't plan on as much as I should	Right amount-because already planning for more
	Got a book from one princ that another could use	Intend to take princ. On instr. Walks w/AP's/Dept. chairs
	Shared fdbk from one	Headed in the right direction

	school with another	
	Tried the buddy thing	
7. Items on your to-do list	Documenting monthly feedback	Norming walks
	Giving fdbk on opening week PD	ICSP/Goal setting
	Planning cluster mtg.	Feedback-coaching vs. just evaluative
	Creating tools for cluster themes	RTI-literacy and behavior
	Feedbk on RTI and school culture plans	ACGR
8. Enjoy most about being a PS?	Autonomy	Watching princs do the job well but differently
	I can see where I've helped	Solving problems, seeing princ. Use fdbk.
		Learning from principals
9-What should be re-examined	Need at least one prof. support person	Need one to two people to coor. And prov. Support
	Person would increase depth and freq. of fdbk.	Need to define supt.'s role in setting distr. Visions
	Perceptions of the IS as the compliance police	Need input on the blueprint
10-What else should I know?	Expectations of IS have been low	District role structure is outstanding
	We need staff-RTI spec., OTL liaison,	Looking forward to paired walkthrough's
		Like answering to a Deputy Chief.
11. How was your time spent?		
Hours in schools	14	19.5-school visits
Hours in other school support	20-21 hours (Ldrshp acad, writing, convos, mtgs.)	13.5 meetings, planning
Other prof. time uses	15 hours writing and answ. Emails/plng. Cluster mtg.	20-emails, call, conversations after hours
12. Anything else?	Very good relat. With	Maybe other offices should be

		supervisor	accountable for operations
			Maybe other offices need more eval authority
			Supts. need more staff or less accountability
			Other offices may need more eval input
			We are monitoring so many things we are losing time for instruc.
			Need offices in central office
			This would allow more collaboration.

References

American College Test [ACT], Inc. (2012). *ACT Profile Report.* (Prince George's
County, MD. Code 217064). Iowa City, IA: Author

Augustine, C., Gonzalez, G., Ikemoto, G. S., Russell, J., Zellman, G., Constant, L., et
al. (2009). *Improving school leadership: The promise of cohesive leadership
systems.* The Rand Corporation, doi: ISBN 978-0-8330-4891-2.

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (December, 2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study
design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*
(4), 544-559. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/sss/QR/QR13-
4/baxter.pdf. *ISSN: 1052-0147*.

Bloom, G., Castagna, C., Moir, E. & Warren, B. (2005). *Blended Coaching: Skills
and Strategies to Support Principal Development*. Thousand Oaks,
California: Corwin Press. ISBN 0-7619-3977-6.

Cotton, K., (2003). *Principals and student achievement.* Alexandria, Virginia:
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

College Board. (2012). *Advanced Placement Scores, Prince George's County, Student
Score Distributions.* New York: College Board.

The Conference Board, The Partnership For 21st Century Skills, Corporate Voices for
Working Families & the Society for Human Resource Management. (2006).
*Are they really ready to work? Employers' perspectives on the basic
knowledge and applied skills of new entrants to the 21st century U.S.
Workforce.* Retrieved from www.conference-board.org (0-8237-0888-8).

Corcoran, A., Casserly, M., Price-Baugh, R., Walston, D., Hall, R. & Simon, C. (2013). *Rethinking leadership: The changing role of principal supervisors*. The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from www.wallacefoundation.org.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Terry Orr, M., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University: Stanford educational leadership institute press tent.

DCPS. (2014). *Impact: The District of Columbia Public Schools Effectiveness Assessment System for School-Based Personnel.* Washington, D.C.: Author

DCPS. (2014a). website: dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/About DCPS/DCPS Data/ DCPS at a Glance. Retrieved on January 25, 2015.

DCPS. (2014b). October, 2014. *When the principal becomes the student.* Press release. Retrieved on January 30, 2015, archived at http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/About DCPS/Press Releases and Announcements/ School News/When the Principal Becomes the Student.

District of Columbia Department of Education. (2013). *School improvement grant (SIG) practice: Developing state-level principal pipelines*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J. & Duffett, A. (2003). *Rolling up their sleeves: Superintendents and principals talk about what's needed to fix public schools.* Public agenda. Retrieved from www.wallacefoundation.org.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Goldman, P., Resnick, L., Bill, V., Johnston, J., Micheaux, D., & Seitz, A. (2008). *The Learning Walk Sourcebook, Version 3.0* (School edition). Available from Institute for Learning. Institute for Learning-Learning Research and Development Center: University of Pittsburgh.

Gordan, E.E. (2009). The future of jobs and careers. *Techniques*, *84* (6), 29.

Grissom, J. . A., & Harrington, J. R. (2010). Investing in administrator efficacy: an examination of professional development as a tool for enhancing principal effectiveness. *American Journal of Education*, *116*, 583 -612.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1996). School context, principal leadership, and student reading achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *96* (5), 527-549.

Honig, M., Copland, M. A., Rainey, L., Lorton, J., & Newton, M. (2010). *Central office transformation for district-wide teaching and learning improvement*. University of Washington: Center for the study of teaching and policy.

Honig, M. (2012). District central office leadership as teaching: How central office administrators support principals' development as instructional leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly 2012*, *48*, 733-744.

Hill, S., Harvey, M. & Harrison, B. (1999). School leaders as learners: What attitudes and preferences do they have? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 46* (1), 25-45.

Kmetz, J. (1982) Elementary School Principals' Work Behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly FALL 1982, 18* (4), 62-78.

LaPointe, M. & Davis, S. (2006). *School leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals.* Stanford, CA.: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* University of Minnesota: Center For Applied Research And Educational Improvement.

Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *46*(671), 671-706.

Lynne, S. D., Graber, J. A., Nichols, T. R., Brooks-Gunn, J. & Botvin, G. J. (2007). Links between pubertal timing, peer influences, and externalizing factors among urban students followed through middle school. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *40*(181), e7-e13.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2007). Achievement matters most: A parent's guide, Maryland's plan for pre-k to 12 education, pp. 20-23. Retrieved from http://mdk12.org/assessments/ayp/index_c.html.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2011). H.S.A. Test Performance Status. Retrieved, October 15, 2012 from http://www.mdreportcard.org/Entity.aspx?K=16AAAA.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2013). Enrollment. Retrieved, November 3, 2013 from http://www.mdreportcard.org/Entity.aspx?K=16AAAA.

McNamara, C. (n.d.) General guidelines for conducting research interviews. Retrieved January 30, 2015, from http:// www.managementhelp.org.

Munger, L. (2013). *Professional learning audit report, Prince George's County*

   Public Schools: Executive summary. Learning Forward Center for Results.

Peterson, K. (2002). The Professional Development of Principals: Innovations

   and Opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *38* (2), 213-232.

PGCPS. (2008). *Theory of action*. Board Policy 0119.

PGCPS. (2009a). *Administrator Procedure 5125: Individual student school – based*

   records.

PGCPS. (2009b). *Negotiated agreement between Prince George's County Educators*

   Association and the Board of Education of Prince George's County

PGCPS. (2011a).*What matters most: Preparing graduates for the 21st century*

   (Strategic Overview, Report No. MISC-1632 5/11)*.*

PGCPS. (2011b). *Office of Talent Development Fall Professional Growth Catalog.*

PGCPS. (2012a). *Office of Talent Development Spring Professional Growth Catalog.*

PGCPS. (2012b). *School-Based Administrator Appraisal System.*

PGCPS. (2012c). *Student-based budgeting resources and budget.*

PGCPS. (2012d).   *School improvement plan Instructional Director review.*

PGCPS. (2012e). *Emergency plan template.*

PGCPS. (2013a). *School strategic plan guidelines– revised 6.6.13.*

PGCPS. (2013b). *Performance management analysis and planning process*

templates.

PGCPS. (2013c). *Principal Appraisal System.*

PGCPS. (2014a). *PGCPS website: http://www1.pgcps.org/aboutpgcps . Facts and*

   Figures, Retrieved on January 25, 2015.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2010). *The three essentials: Improving schools requires district vision, district and state support, and principal leadership.* Atlanta: Southern Region Educational Board.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *42*(5), 573-585.

The Wallace Foundation (2011). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. Author. Retrieved from *www.wallacefoundation.org*.

The Washington Post. St. George, Donna, and Anderson, Nick. (2013, September 26). *SAT scores hit eight-year high in VA.; D.C. also sees gains.* Retrieved from washingtonpost.com on January 25, 2015.