School Leadership Rubrics

The *School Leadership Rubrics* define a range of observable leadership and instructional practices that characterize more and less effective schools. These rubrics provide a metric for identifying and assessing school-wide instructional leadership tasks, recognizing that the principal is a single actor in a complex web of activity that influences student learning. The rubrics were developed by Professor Rich Halverson, in conjunction with the University of Pittsburgh Institute for Learning, drawing on a significant body of research on school effectiveness. The rubrics are divided into 21 subdomains, grouped in five domains to reflect the tasks school leaders focus on to improve teaching and learning:

1. Focus on Learning
2. Monitoring Teaching and Learning
3. Building Nested Learning Communities
4. Acquiring and Allocating Resources
5. Maintaining Safe and Effective Learning Environment

The *School Leadership Rubrics* present a distributed model of task-based school leadership that has guided the development of Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning—CALL. In 2009, after building survey questions based on the rubrics, the survey was revised in a multi-stage review process with input from educational leaders in middle and high schools. For more insight on the theoretical framework behind these rubrics, see:

Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., Ford, B., Markholt, A., McLaughlin, M. W., Milliken, M., & Talbert, J. E. (2003). Leading for learning sourcebook: Concepts and examples. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Murphy, J., Elliot, S., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. (n. d.). Leaders for productive schools. Vanderbilt University: Wallace Foundation.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R. & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23–28.

Domain 1 Focus on Learning	CALL COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING		
Sub-Domains	**Needs attention**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
1.1 Maintaining a school-wide focus on learning	School leaders have not engaged the school community and staff in collaborative conversations about student learning linked to teaching. The school does not have a clear, shared vision for learning; if there is a vision statement, it is regarded by community members as irrelevant to the daily practices of teaching and learning. Leaders have not established a common language for instruction. School leaders rarely arrange meetings to discuss either student achievement data or concrete examples of instructional practice with teachers.	School leaders have engaged the school community and staff in conversations about student learning that serve as the foundation of a shared vision. The school has a collaboratively developed vision statement reflects the actual thinking and practice of teachers. Leaders have made an effort to establish a common language for instruction, but all teachers do not actively use the shared language to discuss their work. School leaders arrange meetings to discuss student achievement data at least twice per year and examples of instructional practice with teachers at least once per year.	School leaders regularly engage the school community and staff in ongoing conversations, 4-6 times per year that serve as the foundation of a collective understanding of student learning. The school has collaboratively developed, and annually revisits, a vision statement of learning that reflects the actual thinking and practices of teachers. Leaders have established a common language for instruction that all teachers actively use to discuss their work. School leaders arrange and conduct monthly meetings to discuss either student achievement data or concrete examples of instructional practice with teachers.
1.2 Formal leaders are recognized as instructional leaders	The principal is not widely recognized as an instructional leader. The principal rarely engages in public instructional leadership activities such as learning walks or teacher evaluation observations. Principals do not involve teachers in the design professional development activities or they leave the design exclusively to teachers. Principals rarely participate in the professional development opportunities they design or are designed for them by the district. Principals comply with district expectations, if present, about leadership training. Principals are passive members of professional organizations.	The school staff recognizes the principal of the school as an instructional leader and occasionally seek his/her input on teaching and learning issues. School leaders engage in weekly public instructional leadership activities such as learning walks or teacher observations. Principals work collaboratively with teachers to coordinate the design of professional and curriculum development activities, and participate in at least one strand of the professional development focused on a critical area of improvement. Principals use what they learn in district leadership training in their schools and begin to collaborate with other school leaders in the district and in professional organizations.	School staff and community stakeholders recognize the principal as an instructional leader in the school and consistently seek his/her input on a variety of instructional issues. Several times per week school leaders engage in public instructional leadership activities such as learning walks or teacher observations. Principals work with teachers to coordinate the professional and curriculum development activities across the school and are frequent, active participants in many of the sessions. Principals organize study groups around common areas of interest or need. Principals are recognized by external networks for their leadership expertise and take leadership roles to share their experiences and collaborate with colleagues in districts and through professional networks.
1.3 Collaborative design of integrated learning plan	Strategies to improve student academic performance are rarely discussed at faculty meetings. Teachers are left to their own devices to come up with strategies for improving instruction. Teachers are unable to recognize or articulate the school's theory of action for instructional improvement. School-wide planning for instructional improvement is either not done or is developed for compliance purposes without regard to the actual instructional practices of the school.	Teachers and leaders work together to refine and develop instructional improvement strategies. The school has developed a structured, collaborative instructional planning process that coordinates specific instructional initiatives toward overall goals of student achievement. Teachers are able to recognize and articulate the school's theory of action for instructional improvement. Strategies to improve student academic performance are discussed at faculty meetings. The school plan reflects the district learning priorities, while simultaneously addressing the needs and instructional priorities of the school.	Strategies to improve student academic performance are the regular focus of faculty meetings. The school has developed a structured, collaborative instructional planning process that uses student achievement data to coordinate specific instructional initiatives toward overall goals of student achievement. Teachers are able to recognize, articulate, and connect their teaching to the school's theory of action for instructional improvement. The plan integrates intermittent measures of student progress toward learning goals. The school plan is well integrated with the district learning plan and simultaneously addresses the needs and instructional priorities of the school.
1.4 Providing appropriate services for students who traditionally struggle	The work of student support staff and the development of student support structures are organized independently from regular classroom teachers. Support staff typically provide services to students disconnected from regular classroom lessons. Classroom teachers expect support staff to take full responsibility for the learning of students who struggle. Leaders fail to plan for coordinating the work of special needs and classroom teachers. Few if any teachers use pre-assessment tools as a basis for differentiation of instruction; differentiation of instruction is rarely observable. Leaders seldom monitor the results of support staff work in terms of improving student learning.	Support staff work together with each other and with teachers to plan instruction and support services for students who struggle, but these services are still mainly provided separately from the regular classroom lessons. Classroom teachers share responsibility for the learning of students who struggle with support staff. Leaders ensure that programs for diverse learners are developed for students who traditionally struggle. Many teachers use pre-assessment tools as a basis for differentiation of instruction in reading, writing and math; differentiation of instruction is often observable. Leaders frequently monitor the results of support staff work in terms of improving student learning.	Support staff work together with each other and with teachers to plan instruction and support services and take collective responsibility for the learning of all students. Instruction and support are usually provided in the context of the regular classroom lessons. Classroom teachers take responsibility for the learning of all students. Leaders work with teachers to develop and monitor differentiated instructional practices for students who traditionally struggle. Teachers consistently use pre-assessment tools as a basis for differentiation in all content areas; differentiation of instruction is regularly observed across subject areas. Leaders have established a collaborative system to review the collective results of support staff work in terms of improving student learning.

Domain 2 Monitoring Teaching and Learning	CALL COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING		
Sub-Domains	**Needs attention**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
2.1 Formative evaluation of student learning	The school lacks systematic methods for providing formative feedback to students in terms of clearly defined standards of student performance. Teachers are responsible for developing formative measures of student learning on their own. Most classroom assessments of student learning elicit low-level student thinking skills such as factual and procedural recall items (e.g. multiple choice, true/ false, short answer) through quizzes or other test formats. Teachers rarely report sharing their practices to provide meaningful, systematic feedback to students at grade level or subject matter meetings. Leaders find that students are unable to describe the quality of their work in terms of clearly understood performance standards. Leaders and teachers are unable to accurately predict how different groups of students will perform on standardized tests.	The school has developed or adopted systematic methods for providing formative feedback to students in terms of clearly defined standards of student performance. Teachers have adopted or developed at least one common formative assessment for measuring student learning in terms of established performance standards. About 1/3 of classroom assessments of student learning elicit high-level student thinking skills such as comprehension, problem-solving and building representations of student understanding through a variety of methods such as classroom discussions, conferring, student writing and quizzes or other test formats. Teachers meet at least once during each reporting cycle to share with colleagues their practices for providing meaningful, systematic feedback to students. Leaders find some students can describe the quality of their work in terms of clearly understood performance standards. Leaders and teachers are able to accurately predict how different groups of students will perform on standardized tests.	Most teachers regularly provide formative feedback to students in terms of shared, clearly defined standards of student performance. Teachers regularly adjust their teaching practices to reflect the formative feedback they have collected about how their students are learning. Over 1/2 of classroom assessments of student learning elicit high-level student thinking skills such as comprehension, problem-solving and building representations of student understanding and more occur through methods such as classroom discussions, conferring, and student writing. Teachers meet more than once during each reporting cycle to share with colleagues their common and individual methods for generating and using formative feedback. Leaders regularly find that students can describe the quality of their work in terms of clearly understood performance standards and what they need to do to improve. Leaders and teachers improve student test performance because they have used the formative assessment system to provide differentiated instruction throughout the academic year.
2.2 Summative evaluation of student learning	Each teacher grades according to local classroom standards of quality. Many of the students who receive passing grades score below proficient on the state test. Teachers and staff have fewer than two annual opportunities to collectively reflect on disaggregated achievement data (grades and test scores) in order to collaboratively redesign the school instructional program. School improvement goals do not use achievement data either to specify concepts within assessed subject areas or subgroups of students for targeted intervention. Teachers report that test preparation activities interrupt the regular instructional program.	There is a shared understanding of what a grade means across grade-levels and classrooms. Most students who receive passing grades pass the state exam. Teachers and staff have 2-5 annual opportunities to collaboratively reflect on achievement data and to redesign the school instructional program. School improvement goals rely on achievement data to specify 1 or 2 concepts within assessed subject areas or a specific subgroup of students for targeted intervention. Teachers report that test preparation activities are separate from, but aligned with, the regular instructional program.	There is a shared, standards-based understanding of what a grade means across grade-levels and classrooms. Student grades in general are an accurate predictor for performance on the state test. Teachers and staff have more than 5 annual opportunities to collaboratively reflect on achievement data and redesign the school instructional program in light of the data. School improvement goals use achievement data to target all the critical concepts in the assessed subject areas and have identified learning goals for all relevant student subgroups. Teachers report that the format and language of state test items are embedded throughout their regular classroom assessments.
2.3 Formative evaluation of teaching	Principals only visit classrooms for formal evaluation or when there is a problem. Teachers have not set goals for instructional improvement. Teachers receive no feedback either from colleagues or from leaders about the quality of their teaching practice. Teachers view classroom visits as evaluative with little value for their instruction. Teachers are left on their own to find instructional ideas or professional networks to improve their practice. Teacher meetings provide fewer than 3 annual opportunities to use samples of typical or exemplary student work to clarify teaching and learning tasks or to distinguish levels of student performance. Leaders and teachers do not discuss the links between student performance (on standardized tests or as defined by national standards) and the quality of teaching practice.	Principals have an established, public practice of monthly classroom visits to better understand classroom teaching. Teachers have set goals for instructional improvement. Teachers get feedback at least monthly from colleagues and from leaders about the quality of their teaching. Teachers view classroom visits as productive with some value for their instruction. Leaders, including principals, connect teachers to relevant instructional ideas or professional networks to improve practice. Teacher meetings use samples of typical or exemplary student work monthly to clarify teaching and learning tasks and to distinguish levels of student performance. Leaders and teachers discuss the links between student performance (on standardized tests or as defined by national standards) and the quality of teaching practice.	Principals visit classrooms more than once per month, strategically monitoring classrooms that need more support. Teachers are an active part of the feedback system in which they give and get feedback at least monthly from colleagues and from leaders about the quality of their teaching linked to their instructional improvement goals. Teachers seek out classroom visits to shape their instruction. Leaders, including principals, connect teachers to relevant instructional ideas or professional networks to improve practice; school-wide resources are allocated based on the teacher needs for improving instructional practice. Teacher meetings integrate samples of typical or exemplary student work into all discussions of student learning. Leaders and teachers define the quality of classroom teaching practice in terms of improving student performance on relevant measures of student learning.
2.4 Summative evaluation of teaching	Teacher evaluation practices are guided by policies and forms that focus on performance checklists and do not reflect research on appropriate models of teaching and learning. Evaluation forms are generic, not customized for non-classroom teaching and support staff. Evaluation practice usually involves a single classroom visit, and the occasions are chosen for convenience rather than for purpose. Formal evaluation practices are primarily used to document poor performance or to fulfill legal requirements. Summative evaluations are not used to inform the teachers' instructional improvement goals. The evaluation process is not linked to standards of best practice, school- wide learning goals or measures of student learning.	Teacher evaluation practices are guided by policies and forms that focus on research-based models for teaching and learning. Separate evaluation policies and forms are customized for the non-classroom teaching and support staff. Evaluation practice usually involves multiple classroom visits, but the occasions for evaluation are chosen for convenience rather than for purpose. Formal evaluation practices are primarily used to document poor performance or to fulfill legal requirements. Summative evaluations are used to inform the teachers' instructional improvement goals. The evaluation process is linked to standards of best practice and school-wide learning goals, but not to measures of student learning.	Teacher evaluation practices are guided by policies and forms that focus on research-based models for teaching and learning. Separate evaluation policies and forms are customized for for different grade-level and subject-matter expectations for classroom teachers, as well as for non-classroom teaching and support staff. Evaluation practice involves multiple classroom visits, and the occasions for evaluation are chosen to purposely observe key aspects of the teacher's practice. Evaluation practices are used to document poor teaching and to fulfill legal requirements as well as to provide feedback for accomplished teachers. The design of the evaluation process integrates measures of student learning and is linked with standards of best practices and the school-wide learning goals.

CALL — COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING

Sub-Domains	Needs attention	Proficient	Exemplary
3.1 Collaborative school-wide focus on problems of teaching and learning	The school addresses a variety of uncoordinated instructional problems every year. Professional development, curriculum design and school improvement planning are not explicitly linked to collaboratively recognized problems of teaching and learning. Meetings at which school instructional initiatives are discussed are mainly informational rather than participatory. Collaborative activities tend to focus mainly on addressing student concerns or non-instructional problems. The enacted solutions are disconnected from each other and from existing structures and practices. Individual teachers are left alone to reconcile these disconnected solutions.	The school has developed a long-term, coordinated plan for the improvement of teaching and learning. Professional development, curriculum design and school improvement planning are linked to focus on a variety of collaboratively recognized problems of teaching and learning. Meetings at which school instructional initiatives are discussed are balanced between informational and participatory formats. Collaborative inquiry activities routinely focus on linking issues of teaching practice to student learning results. The enacted solutions are aligned with existing initiatives and future goals. Teachers collaborate to plan and develop how new solutions will help realize teaching and learning goals.	The school has collaboratively developed a long-term, coordinated plan for the improvement of teaching and learning. Professional development, curriculum design and school improvement planning are linked to a few collaboratively prioritized problems of teaching and learning. Most meetings at which school instructional initiatives are discussed actively engage teachers' experience with the prioritized problems of teaching and learning. Collaborative inquiry activities include intermediate timelines and benchmarks to determine whether new practices are helping achieve student learning goals. The enacted solutions are aligned with existing initiatives and future goals. Teachers and leaders collaborate to refine solutions, build on initiatives within and across their disciplines, and spark long-term practices for meet shared teaching and learning goals.
3.2 Professional learning	Professional learning is disconnected from the school instructional goals. Leaders do not create professional learning plans with individual teachers. Teachers pursue professional enrichment, either in the form of coursework or participation in professional conferences networks, at their own initiative. Formal in-service time is spent on disseminating information regarding assorted, disconnected topics. Teachers are dissatisfied with the school-organized professional learning opportunities. There are no formal measures of professional development effectiveness; or, if there are measures, they focus on teacher satisfaction with professional development.	The school has developed a long-term plan for continuous support of professional growth that integrates individual teacher needs with whole school goals. Leaders create professional learning plans with teachers that allow teachers to link school-level and personal enrichment activities. In addition to informational sessions, adequate structured time is provided for staff to engage in collaborative professional learning activities. Teachers value school-organized professional learning opportunities. Measures of professional development effectiveness find that some teachers are applying what they learned to their classroom.	The school has developed a long-term plan for focused support of professional growth in key instructional areas that provides differentiated support for individual teacher ability in terms of whole-school instructional goals. Leaders create professional learning plans with teachers to link school-wide and personal learning, and create opportunities for expert teachers to share with colleagues in meaningful ways. Teachers are encouraged to participate in professional networks outside the school. Information is disseminated across multiple media to allow adequate time for staff to engage in and reflect upon professional development activities. Teachers organize and lead school-organized professional learning opportunities. Summative and formative assessments are developed and used to determine how the professional development program guides classroom teaching and learning for all teachers.
3.3 Socially distributed leadership	Teachers and staff do not participate in school-wide instructional, scheduling and budgetary decisions, or are uncertain about how these decisions are made. Innovative ideas are not respected, supported or disseminated by formal school leaders. Some informal leaders thwart the agenda of the formal leaders. There is no shared understanding of which tasks best contribute to improving student learning. and of which members of the school community are best suited to engage in those tasks. Leaders assign teams based on social or practical reasons, rather than according to the suitability of team members to achieve their goals.	Teachers and staff participate in some school-wide instructional, scheduling and budgetary decisions, but are uncertain about how some of these decisions are ultimately made. Innovative teachers are identified and recognized by formal school leaders, and invited to share their practices and ideas with colleagues. Informal leaders support the agenda of the formal leaders. There is a shared understanding of which tasks best contribute to improving student learning, but limited understanding of which members of the school community are best suited to lead those tasks. Leaders assign teams based on suitability of team members to achieve their goals.	The school-wide instructional, scheduling and budgetary decision-making process is fully transparent and reflects the priorities established through teacher and staff participation in a collaborative planning process. Teachers successful at improving student learning are actively identified, recruited and encouraged as informal leaders for school improvement, and are given the authority and resources by formal school leaders to share their practices and ideas to shape the work of colleagues. Informal leaders work with formal leaders to create the agenda for improving teaching and learning. The tasks that will improve student learning are well-defined and articulated across the school, and the appropriate members of the school community lead those tasks. Faculty and staff teams begin to self- organize based on their diagnosis of school learning needs and on their shared history of successful collaborative engagement on instructional improvement tasks.
3.4 Coaching and mentoring	Teachers who have expertise in content or pedagogy are not encouraged to engage in coaching or mentoring practices that share information, experiences, and/or knowledge with other colleagues. Formal coaches and mentors are chosen for experience rather than established expertise. Coaching roles are not clearly defined, and consequently coaches spend more time on administrative tasks than on working with teachers. Coaches spend less than one day per week in classrooms observing instruction, teaching model lessons, or interacting with students. Leaders do not oversee the allocation of coaching time and allow coaches to establish their own relationships.	Teachers who have expertise in content or pedagogy are encouraged to engage in coaching or mentoring practices that share information, experiences, and/or knowledge with other colleagues. Formal coaches and mentors are chosen for established expertise in addition to experience. Coaching roles are defined. Coaches spend more than half of their time supporting teaching and learning. Coaches spend at least one day per week in classrooms observing instruction, teaching model lessons, or interacting with students. Leaders focus coaching efforts toward individual teachers.	Structured time is provided for teachers who have expertise in content or pedagogy to engage in coaching or mentoring practices that share information, experiences, and/or knowledge with other colleagues. Formal coaches and mentors are chosen because their expertise fits the instructional needs of the school. Coaching roles defined in terms of the instructional improvement goals of the school, and coaches spend over 3/4 of their time supporting teaching and learning. Coaches spend at least two days per week in classrooms observing instruction, teaching model lessons, or interacting with students. Leaders focus coaching efforts toward teaching practice in high-need subject areas as determined through the analysis of assessments.

Domain 4 Acquiring and Allocating Resources

CALL — COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING

Sub-Domains	Needs attention	Proficient	Exemplary
4.1 Personnel practices	Less than 100% of teachers are certified and/or meet requirements to teach in their assigned subject areas and grade levels. There are no induction and ongoing mentoring programs. Staff are assigned to instructional responsibilities based on seniority or on openings in the school staff. There are few incentives available to reward teachers for excellent performance. The performance of struggling teachers is inadequately documented or supported, and poor teachers are allowed to continue in their work.	All teachers are certified and/or meet requirements to teach in their assigned subject areas and grade levels. There are induction and ongoing mentoring programs for some teachers. Staff are assigned to instructional responsibilities based on student learning needs, seniority or staff openings. Leaders find ways to reward individual teachers for excellent performance. The performance of struggling non-tenured and tenured teachers is well-documented in terms of shared performance standards, but when appropriate support does not result in adequate improvement, recommendations for dismissal are seldom implemented.	All teachers are certified and/or meet requirements to teach in their assigned subject areas and grade levels. There are induction and ongoing mentoring programs for all teachers. Leaders maintain staff instructional assignments based on demonstrated teaching expertise and change assignments based on a collective responsibility for student learning needs, rather than on seniority or staff openings.
4.2 Structuring and maintaining time	Leaders expect staff to use time as an instructional resource, but do not structure time used for professional learning. Shared time for planning is often co-opted and used for non-instructional issues. Leaders typically do not guide or participate with teachers in professional learning activities.	Leaders support and assist staff to protect time as a valuable resource in providing quality instruction, but leaders do not focus time use around resolving the critical, shared problems of instruction. Shared time for planning is seldom co-opted or used for non-instructional issues. Leaders often guide and participate in professional learning activities.	Leaders structure professional learning time to address the critical issues of instruction identified through school improvement process. Time is provided for whole-school, grade and subject-matter level planning, curriculum design and reflection. Leaders provide feedback and model effective uses of professional learning for teachers.
4.3 School resources are focused on student learning	Leaders perceive they have little discretion to acquire and allocate human, material or financial resources. Leaders do not use the budget process to repurpose resources for local instructional goals. Staff expect each department or program to receive equal funding increases or cuts. Leaders are willing to accept new funding regardless of fit with existing instructional priorities. Budgeting is an opaque process that does not publicly illustrate school priorities for improving teaching and learning.	Leaders perceive they have a limited range of discretion for allocating necessary human, material and financial resources. Leaders are able to link budgets, school improvement, professional development plans to school-wide goals for student learning. Fiscal and performance data are used to make informed decisions about funding increases and cuts. Leaders only accept new funding if there is a fit with existing instructional priorities. There is a transparent budgeting process that illustrates school priorities for sustained improvement.	Leaders perceive they have considerable range of discretion for allocating and acquiring necessary human, material and financial resources. Leaders base decisions about budgets and school improvement on school-wide goals for student learning. Leaders discuss fiscal and performance data with staff to make informed decisions about funding increases and cuts. Leaders and staff are successful at seeking out new funding that fits with existing instructional priorities. There is a transparent budgeting process that incorporates staff input and is communicated to stakeholders.
4.4 Integrating external expertise into school instructional program	Leaders choose or accept the services of district experts and external consultants based on availability or on recent educational fads rather than a match to the school's needs. School leaders turn over the work of school improvement to experts or consultants. Leaders inform staff about the new services and requirements for participation. Leaders do not integrate new services with existing school priorities. Few teachers participate in professional networks outside the school.	Leaders choose or reject the services of district experts and external consultants based on their ability to help the school achieve instructional goals. Leaders influence district priorities for improvement and the allocation of district expertise to their school. Leaders establish structures and processes for the work of experts and consultants in their school and have evidence of the progress they are making. Leaders expect district consultants and external experts to integrate their services with existing school priorities and to coordinate their work with each other. Some teachers participate in professional networks outside the school.	Leaders actively recruit the services of district experts and external consultants to support the achievement of school instructional goals and to provide perspective on school progress. School leaders influence the design of district improvement initiatives and the work of district experts. Leaders guide the work of experts and consultants in their school and monitor impact on teaching and learning. Leaders make explicit connections between new services and existing school priorities and ensure coordination of efforts among experts and consultants. Most teachers participate in professional networks outside the school.
4.5 Coordinating and supervising relations with families and the external communities	Other than parent-teacher conferences, there are no scheduled occasions to make instructional practices or the school curriculum public to all families. The school has no effective systems in place to provide families with timely information about attendance or problems with student learning. The school does not use information technologies, such as websites, social networking sites or e-mail, to convey the substance of the school instructional program. Most teachers use communication technologies (e.g., phone, e-mail, texting, websites) to contact fewer than 10% of families per month to discuss academic progress, strategies for improvement, or to commend students' successes. School leaders simply schedule public meetings and notify the public as required by district policy.	Occasions are scheduled at least twice per semester to make instructional practices or the school curriculum public to all families. The school has an effective system in place to provide most families with timely information about attendance or problems with student learning. The school uses information technologies, such as websites, social networking sites or e-mail, to convey the substance of the school instructional program. Most teachers use communication technologies (e.g., phone, e-mail, texting, websites) to maintain regular contact with families of the students who are making little academic progress. School leaders work with family and community groups to determine the best occasions and places for public meetings.	Monthly occasions are scheduled to make instructional practices or the school curriculum public to all families. The school has an effective system in place to provide all families with timely information about attendance or problems with student learning. The school uses information technologies, such as websites, social networking sites or e-mail, to interact with parents and the community about the substance of the school instructional program. Most teachers use communication technologies (e.g., phone, e-mail, texting, websites) to maintain regular contact regarding student progress with all families. School leaders work with family and community groups to determine the best occasions and places for public meetings and dedicate resources to help families to attend.

Domain 5 Maintaining a Safe and Effective Learning Environment	CALL COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING		
Sub-Domains	**Needs attention**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
5.1 Clear, consistent and enforced expectations for student behavior	Discipline policies are inconsistent or not enforced at all. The responsibility for enforcement is left to individual teachers. Discipline policies are rarely reviewed. Most students perceive behavior polices as unfairly or randomly enforced.	Discipline policies are enforced consistently throughout the school. Teachers and leaders work together to ensure fair enforcement. Discipline policies are annually reviewed. Most students perceive behavioral expectations to be fairly designed and enforced.	Discipline policies are equitably and consistently enforced. Teachers and leaders work together to ensure fair enforcement. Teachers and leaders use data on student conduct and achievement to review and adjust policies. Students take ownership by participating in the development and peer-enforcement of behavior policies.
5.2 Safe learning environment	District/school safety policies or procedures do not reflect conditions in the school. Significant numbers of students are involved in fighting, theft, selling or using drugs, or are perpetrators or victims of harassment. School-wide assemblies are rare and difficult to control. School-wide announcements that interrupt classroom teaching typically occur more than three times per day.	District/school safety policies or procedures reflect conditions in the school but are not regularly reviewed. A small minority of students are involved in fighting, theft, selling or using drugs, or are perpetrators or victims of harassment. Students interact civilly at regular school-wide assemblies. School-wide announcements that interrupt classroom teaching typically occur between two and three times per day.	District/school safety policies and procedures reflect school conditions and are annually reviewed. Virtually no students are involved in fighting, theft, selling or using drugs, or are perpetrators or victims of harassment. Students regularly lead and interact civilly at school-wide assemblies. School-wide announcements that interrupt classroom teaching typically occur fewer than two times per day.
5.3 Student support services provide safe haven for students who traditionally struggle	The school often mis-categorizes students with special needs and is unable to provide services to successfully improve learning for most identified students. The school has underspecified plans for improving attendance, dropout and graduation rates for students who traditionally struggle. No pool of adult mentors or advocates is available for struggling students.	The school effectively identifies students with special needs but is unable to provide services to successfully improve learning for most identified students. The school has a plan in place and has made progress in improving attendance, dropout and graduation rates for students who traditionally struggle. Students can volunteer to meet with a pool of adult mentors and advocates for academic and social assistance.	The school effectively identifies students with special needs and successfully provides services to improve learning for most identified students. Leaders work with teachers across the school to continually revise plans for improving attendance, dropout and graduation rates for students who traditionally struggle. An extensive pool of adult mentors and advocates contact students in need to provide academic and social assistance.
5.4 Buffering the teaching environment	Leaders require teachers to resolve parent and district concerns on their own. The school can fail to meet expectations for classroom access in two ways. 1) The school restricts public access to classroom teachers too tightly. Parents and visitors feel unwelcome in the school, and teaches are reluctant to talk about their work with visitors. 2)The school provides too little control over classroom visitors. Teachers find it difficult to focus on teaching and learning because of external interruptions.	School leaders are able to help teachers deal with parent concerns. Leaders have developed good relations with the district leaders and are able to effectively filter and pass on relevant information to teachers. Leaders have established reliable procedures to provide public access to teachers and classrooms. Teachers feel comfortable with classroom visitors.	School leaders are able to help teachers deal with parent concerns. Leaders are able to relate the message of successful achievement at the school to district and community leaders. This message helps leaders serve as successful advocates for district resources and to filter resources effectively to teachers. Leaders have established and regularly review reliable procedures to control access to the classroom. Teachers welcome classroom visitors.