School Check

A self-assessment tool for strategic resource use

This school assessment tool is based over a decade's worth of research into the resource practices of high-performing schools across the country, as well as findings from **The Strategic School: Making the Most of People, Time, and Money**, by Karen Hawley Miles and Stephen Frank (2008). The purpose of this tool is to help you do a healthy school checkup: Thinking about your current structure, where are and aren't you using resources strategically? Are there any areas in which you could reduce spending? Areas where you should increase your current investment?

The assessment is organized around six design essentials that we've seen high-performing schools focus on to organize resources.

1. Adult Culture
2. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
3. Personalized Learning
4. Collaborative Work and Professional Growth
5. Talent Management and Teacher Leadership
6. School Community & Social-Emotional Support

Within each essential, we've laid out more specific strategic practices and written descriptors that identify what these practices look like along a developmental spectrum. Keep in mind that this tool is designed to be a conversation starter, *not* a high-stakes evaluation of resource use at a school; our descriptors are leading indicators of success, but they are not absolute "to do's" that every school must accomplish right away. It may be a strategic choice for a school to be farther behind on the developmental spectrum for any given practice given its priorities and student needs. In fact, it's a fundamental premise of resource use that while you can do *anything*, you can't do *everything.* Finally, please note that while in many places we've used specific quantitative cut points to clearly distinguish between developmental levels, these cut points are also designed to be conversation starters, not absolute divisions between "good" and "bad" practices.

To engage fully with *School Check,* you will need to support your conversation with:

the following quantitative data:	and a qualitative understanding of current:
- Class sizes - Bell schedules - Staffing plans - Individual teacher effectiveness data - Teacher schedules - Historical and projected retention trends	- Student intervention strategies - Teaming structures and practices - Individual professional growth structures - Hiring practices - Formal or informal differentiation of teacher roles - Use of technology - Partnerships

ADULT CULTURE

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
There is collective ownership among faculty and staff over a vision for what effective teaching and learning looks like. * This refers to shared ownership over the *instructional vision* for what teachers can and should do in their classrooms on a daily basis.	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers at my school share a common vision for effective teaching and learning.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
There is collective agreement over school improvement goals and visiblity into progress against these goals over time.	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* There is collective agreement over school improvement goals and visiblity into progress against these goals over time.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* These measures of progress inform daily actions and decisions.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Colleagues and leaders have a shared commitment to the continuous learning of adults and students.	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* My school leader is committed to improving my instructional practice.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers demonstrate a shared commitment to the continuous learning of adults and students.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers receive feedback and coaching that can help them improve teaching.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers at my school are encouraged to reflect on their own practices.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Colleagues and leaders are open to difficult conversations and engage in constructive conflict.	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers and leaders are open to difficult conversations and engage in constructive conflict.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%

ADULT CULTURE

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Colleagues and leaders trust each other.	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers in my school feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to them.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* Teachers in my school feel safe taking instructional risks/innovating when they think it will benefit their students, and ask for help in doing so.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Teacher Survey	*% of teachers agreeing with the following statement:* I feel that my school leadership genuinely listens to me and that my voice is heard.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Colleagues and leaders problem solve and work together in a collaborative environment.	All	Teacher Survey	% of teachers agreeing with the following statement: Colleagues and leaders problem solve and work together in a collaborative environment.			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
					OVERALL SCORE	

CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND ASSESSMENT

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
School leaders and teachers have collective ownership over a clearly articulated **instructional vision** which defines their approach to teaching and learning, includes subject-specific practices, and is informed by rigorous expectations for excellent teaching.	All	N/A	The school's instructional vision includes expectations for student learning that:			
			Are not college-and-career-ready-standards (CCRS) aligned	Include skills and content, are CCRS-aligned, but aren't consistently subject- and/or grade-specific	Include skills and content, are subject- and grade-specific, and are CCRS-aligned, for most grades	Include skills and content, are subject- and grade-specific, and are CCRS-aligned, for all grades
	All	N/A	The school's instructional vision includes expectations for teaching that are:			
			Not clearly defined	Clearly defined but not consistently CCRS-aligned	Clearly defined and CCRS-aligned	Clearly defined, CCRS-aligned, and directly connected to student learning goals
	All	Staff Survey	The proportion of school staff who can describe the school's instructional vision and how it plays out in teaching and learning practices is:			
			Less than 50%	Between 50% and 75%	Between 76% and 90%	More than 90%
	All	IPG Tool	The percentage of teachers who consistently and effectively enact the instructional vision is:			
			Less than 50%	Between 50% and 75%	Between 76% and 90%	More than 90%
All core teachers have access to and effectively use vetted **CCRS-aligned curricular materials** for ELA and math including scope and sequence, unit plans, daily lesson plans, and student work exemplars.	All	N/A	Based on a rigorous subject-specific evaluation tool and criteria (e.g., IMET, GIMET-QR, EdReports), core curriculum has been effectively vetted as CCRS-aligned and high-quality in:			
			Less than 49%	Some grades	Most grades	All grades
	All	N/A	Based on a rigorous subject-specific evaluation tool and criteria (e.g., EQUIP), individual unit and lesson plans have been effectively vetted as CCRS-aligned and high-quality in:			
			Few grades or none	Some grades	Most grades	All grades
	All	Classroom Observation Tool	Based on a CCRS-aligned observation tool (e.g. IPG), the proportion of classrooms that display a high degree of high-quality CCRS-aligned instruction is:			
			Less than 50%	Between 50% and 75%	Between 76% and 90%	More than 90%
	All	N/A	Teachers consistently use CCRS-aligned curriculum and materials for the vast majority of their instruction:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always

CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND ASSESSMENT

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
All teachers have access to and regularly use rigorous **informal formative assessment tasks** aligned to the CCRS and the curriculum.	All	N/A	High-quality rigorous student tasks are embedded in the curriculum and materials that teachers use:			
			Rarely or never	In some lessons	In most lessons, 3-4 times a week	In all lessons daily
	All	N/A	Most teachers use informal assessment tasks to collect useful student data that informs instruction:			
			Less than twice a month	At least every other week	1 to 3 times per week	3 or more times per week
Common interim assessments are aligned with CCRS/end-of-year goals and administered by all same-subject teachers in a grade at least 4-6 times a year.	All	N/A	Based on a rigorous subject-specific evaluation tool and criteria (e.g., AET, Assessment Quality Criteria Checklists), interim assessments have been effectively vetted as CCRS-aligned and high quality in:			
			Very few grades or none	Some grades	Most grades	All grades
	All	N/A	Common interim assessments are administered by all same-subject teachers in a grade 4-6 times a year according to a set schedule:			
			Rarely or never	For some grades or core subjects	For most grades or core subjects	For all grades and core subjects
Timely, useful data reports from interim assessments are made available to staff and used to adjust instruction.	All	N/A	Data from all assessments is made available in a timely manner (no more than one week between administration of assessment and completion of grading):			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
	All	N/A	Data from common interim assessments is made available to teachers in easy-to-use reports which facilitate question-level analysis:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
					OVERALL SCORE	

COLLABORATIVE WORK & PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Teaching teams are organized to collaboratively design rigorous CCRS-aligned instruction, target supports for students, improve culture, and deepen teachers' understanding of professional growth topics	All	N/A	Teaching teams are accountable for accomplishing specific purposes during collaborative planning time (CPT):			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	The percentage of core subject teachers who participate in shared content teams that collaboratively design rigorous CCRS-aligned instruction, including planning instruction, analyzing student work and data, and grouping students for targeted support is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	N/A	The percentage of core subject teachers who participate in vertical teams (teams with same content across grades) is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	N/A	The percentage of core subject teachers who participate in shared student teams (teams focused on RTI, culture, family engagement, etc.) is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	N/A	Productive CPT is supported through clear objective-driven agendas and protocols and tools for making decisions and completing work:			
			Less than 49%	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	Time in teams is intentionally used for teachers to deepen their understanding of professional growth topics introduced in faculty or district PD and continued through to individual coaching:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
Feedback systems with calibrated observation measures and tools ensure teachers receive specific, actionable, sustained coaching from qualified instructional experts.	All	ERS Team Review	Observation and coaching tools are specific to subject, grade band, and CCRS.			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	ERS Team Review	Observation and coaching tools are aligned with the school's/district's formal teacher evaluation tool:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	During the school year, cycles of observation and coaching are provided to each teacher on average:			
			Three times or fewer	Four times	Every three weeks	Every two weeks or more
	All	N/A	Coaching is specific, actionable and sustained on the target skill until proficiency is consistently observed:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	ERS Team Review	The coaching and supervision structure ensures each instructional expert's span of review (i.e., number of people he/she is responsible for supporting) is no more than 12 to 1:			
			For No Instructional Experts	For a Few Instructional Experts	For Some Instructional Experts	For All Instructional Experts

COLLABORATIVE WORK & PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Professional growth and teaming is supported by qualified instructional experts who focus on specific subjects and grade bands and who are continuously building upon their own content knowledge and skills in order to support teachers in planning and teaching to college and career ready standards.	All	N/A	Prior to hiring and/or assignment, instructional experts demonstrate their expertise by subject and grade level, and in particular in the context of CCRS:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	Instructional experts are assigned to facilitate teams and observe and coach teachers in the content areas and grade bands in which they have demonstrated expertise in the context of CCRS:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	Instructional experts receive training, pursue ongoing professional learning, and formally support each other to continuously build both CCRS content knowledge and instructional application, and their effective coaching practices and tools:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
Teachers and instructional experts are deliberately assigned to teams to maximize the collective learning and teaching potential of the group.	All	N/A	Schoolwide, the percentage of shared content teams that have the necessary combination of CCRS knowledge and instructional expertise to collaboratively design CCRS-aligned instruction is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	N/A	Schoolwide, the proportion of shared content teams that include the special education and English learner teachers at all regularly scheduled CPT meetings is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%

COLLABORATIVE WORK & PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Schoolwide professional growth support is focused on a few topics informed by student and teacher data, aligned to a CCRS-informed instructional vision, and realized through a comprehensive, year-long professional growth plan to ensure sufficient learning and practice time to achieve mastery.	All	N/A	Student and teacher data and the CCRS instructional vision inform the selection of a few topics for sustained professional growth support annually:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	ERS Team Review	School's year-long professional growth plan:			
			Doesn't Exist	Includes Key PD Dates	Focuses on a few topics and includes key PD dates and assessment/analysis windows	Focuses on a few topics and includes key PD dates, assessment/analysis windows, and CPT and coaching themes
			Teachers receive enough support and coaching to practice a new skill until they attain mastery:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
Individual professional growth support is **differentiated based on teacher need,** as measured through multiple data sources.	All	N/A	Individual professional growth goals linked to performance standards and school priorities are collaboratively developed at the start of the year.			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	Data is used to identify teachers' professional growth needs and differentiate support needed:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	New and struggling teachers receive more and targeted professional growth support from instructional experts:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always

COLLABORATIVE WORK & PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Sufficient time is scheduled for collaborative work and professional growth.	All	ERS Team Review	Time scheduled for collaborative planning time for teaching teams that share content is:			
			Not Scheduled	Less than 60 minutes weekly	Between 60-90 consecutive minutes weekly	90 or more consecutive minutes weekly
	All	N/A	Time scheduled for collaborative planning time for teaching teams that share content vertically is:			
			Never	1 time annually	2-3 times annually	Quarterly
	All	N/A	Time scheduled for collaborative planning time for teaching teams that share students is:			
			Not Scheduled	Less than 60 minutes bi-weekly	Between 60-90 consecutive minutes bi-weekly	90 or more consecutive minutes bi-weekly
	All	N/A	All faculty participate in the following number of days for professional growth before the start of the school year:			
			No Days	1 to 3	4 to 5	6 to 10
	All	ERS Team Review	The school year calendar includes the following time for faculty professional development:			
			Infrequent meetings and/or PD sessions	Monthly faculty or ILT meetings only	1 to 3 half days every month	1 half day every full week (or time equivalent by month)
	All	N/A	Instructional experts spend the following proportions of their time observing, coaching, and evaluating teachers; planning for and facilitating data-driven CPT meetings and other PD; and improving their own CCRS knowledge and coaching skills:			
			Less than 40%	40-59%	60 to 80%	More than 80%
	All	N/A	Time allocated to support the professional learning of instructional experts, including instructional expert development meetings, group learning walks, outside/district professional development, and weekly principal supervision, is:			
			Not Scheduled	Less than 60 minutes bi-weekly	Between 60-90 consecutive minutes bi-weekly	More than 90 consecutive minutes bi-weekly
					OVERALL SCORE	

SCHOOL COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SUPPORT

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Each student is known deeply by adults in the school.	All	Student Surveys	The percentage of students who feel well known in my school is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Class size matrix	In high-priority areas, low loads (number of distinct students a teacher is responsible for knowing) are often used as a tool to support deep relationships between students and teachers. In high-priority areas in my school, teacher loads are:			
			100+ students	100–70 students	50–70 students	Fewer than 50 students
Students have deep and respectful personal relationships with other students.	All	Student Surveys	The percent of students who agree that they have deep and respectful relationships with other students is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Consistent expectations for behavior and school-wide routines are grounded in a vision for school values fully shared by students, families and staff.	All	N/A	My school's values, grounded in a vision for how we should treat each other:			
			Don't exist, or exist in a very limited way	Exist, but without strong buy-in	Exist, and the majority of teachers and staff buy in	Exist and are fully embraced by the whole school community
	All	Parent Surveys	The percentage of parents/families who agree that school values are communicated clearly to them is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Parent Surveys	The percentage of parents/families who feel welcomed and participate in school:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	N/A	Expectations for behavior and routines are promoted through:			
			Isolated systems in individual classrooms	No school-wide systems, but some team-generated common systems	Common, school-wide systems-- however, implementation is inconsistent	Common, school-wide systems with consistent implementation
	All	N/A	Structures exist that dedicate time and staff to upholding school values (e.g., professional development, morning meeting, Dean of Culture, etc.):			
			Rarely or never	In some cases, and do not fully meet needs	Mostly, but do not fully meet needs	Always, and fully meet the continuum of students' needs
Students have the opportunity to connect with their school's community on the basis of personal interests and motivations.	All	Student Surveys	The percentage of students who feel personally connected to their school community on the basis of personal interests and motivations is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%

SCHOOL COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SUPPORT

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Students have developmentally appropriate opportunities to learn and practice core SEL competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills and responsible decision-making.	All	N/A	A research-based, developmentally appropriate curriculum is used with fidelity:			
			Rarely or never	In some classrooms	In most classrooms	In all classrooms
	All	Schedule	Sufficient time is dedicated during the student day to learning and practicing these competencies (e.g., morning meeting or advisory):			
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Students who need more intensive support are identified and linked to effective services quickly, using outside providers when necessary.	All	N/A	Relevant data on social-emotional indicators is used to inform interventions:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	Students who need more intensive social-emotional support are referred to external providers:			
			Rarely or never	Too slowly- students' needs typically intensify before accessing support	Quickly enough for some students who require support but not others	Quickly for all students who require support
	All	N/A	A clear system to link students to external providers when necessary is:			
			Non-existent	Defined, but not used with fidelity	Functional for most students	Highly efficient with clearly defined roles
A feedback loop exists between classroom teachers, external and school-based SEL support providers and students' families.	All	N/A	A feedback loop among classroom teachers, external and school-based SEL support providers and students' families is implemented:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
	All	N/A	Classroom teachers work with external and school-based SEL experts on how to better support high-needs students:			
			Rarely or never	On an ad hoc basis	Regularly, but not through a defined process	Regularly, through a clear process with defined roles
					OVERALL SCORE	

PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Core content courses provide **rigorous grade-level instruction for all students** using CCRS-aligned curriculum and materials.	All	N/A	The school has shared and CCRS-aligned expectations for the level of rigor in student tasks and how they are assessed/graded:			
			For only some grades and/or content areas	For most grades, in ELA and math only	For all grades, in ELA and math only	For all grades and content areas
	MS, HS	N/A	Your course taking sequence:			
			Is not aligned with rigorous graduation requirements or college and career ready standards	Is deliberately designed to enable some students, regardless of entry point, to graduate college and career ready	Is deliberately designed to enable most students, regardless of entry point, to graduate college and career ready	Is deliberately designed to enable all students, regardless of entry point, to graduate college and career ready
	All	Classroom Observation Tool	Based on a CCRS-aligned observation tool (e.g. IPG), the proportion of classrooms that display a high degree of high-quality CCRS-aligned instruction is:			
			Less than 50%	Between 50% and 75%	Between 76% and 90%	More than 90%
	All	Bell Schedule	Highest priority content areas are allocated:			
			<15% additional learning time	15-30% more time than other content areas	30-50% more time than other content areas	≥50% more time than other content areas
Instructional **strategies and supports are differentiated** in all courses to ensure students have the right supports to meet academic goals.	All	N/A	Students within the same classroom receive different supports and instructional strategies, such as small group instruction, based on relevant student data, to meet the same content mastery goals:			
			Less than 49%	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always

PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
School **resources are deliberately matched** to student needs to ensure **sufficient time, expertise, and attention** for content mastery for all students.	All	Master Schedule	The percentage of students who have sufficient time in their course schedules for them to master core content is:			
			Less than 49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
	All	Master Schedule	The percentage of students who have more than 1 period/day that is unscheduled is:			
			More than 20%	11-20%	5-10%	less than 5%
	All	Master Schedule	Students who are struggling are allocated:			
			No additional targeted learning time	Some additional time in target area	50% more time in target area than students who are at proficient levels	More than 50% more time in target area than students who are proficient
	All	Master Schedule	High-priority areas (high-priority subjects, transition grades, courses for struggling students) are assigned the most effective and expert teachers:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
	All	Master Schedule, Class Size Matrix	Group sizes are reduced for high priority areas (high priority subjects, transition grades, remedial/support courses, courses for struggling students) by assigning additional staff and/or scheduling varying period lengths:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
	All	Class Size Matrix	For subjects that require extensive feedback (e.g., writing) and/or settings where students need more individualized attention, teacher loads (total number of students a teacher teaches throughout the week) are:			
			100+ students	100–70 students	50–70 students	Fewer than 50 students

PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Supports, interventions, and student groupings are **adjusted frequently** based on data of student progress.	All	N/A	Targeted student groupings for extra support (including changes to group size, content focus, tech use, and/or assignment to teachers) are:			
			Fixed—changes are made only at year's end	Adjusted infrequently	Adjusted at least four times a year	Adjusted more than 4 times a year based on student progress
	All	N/A	Assignments and adjustments to differentiation and intervention structures are based on:			
			No formal data informs adjustments or interventions	Anecdotal data and/or assessments that are not common among teachers	A limited number of data sources, at least one of which includes informal formative assessment tasks, interim assessments, or end of course assessments	Several data sources, informal formative assessment tasks, interim assessments, and end of course assessments

PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Students are enrolled in learning environments that **meet their needs while maximizing opportunities for heterogeneous** settings.	All	N/A	Special education and ELL (specialists) services are:			
			Isolated from core instruction	Delivered mostly through pullout—however, there is good communication between specialists and regular education teachers on student goals, progress, and interventions	Delivered through an inclusion model whenever possible and integrated into the school's skill-based grouping strategy—however, specialists serve students with disabilities or ELLs only	Delivered through an inclusion model whenever possible and integrated to align smoothly with core instruction; specialists form skill-based groups that may include general education students
	All	N/A	Students spend the following amount of time in heterogenous classes:			
			Almost none	Some	Most	Almost all
					OVERALL SCORE	

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
The school vision and assets (i.e. what makes this school an excellent place to work) are defined and marketed to attract great teachers who fit hiring priorities.	All	N/A	My school has deliberately defined assets (e.g., collaborative culture, frequent coaching) that attracts high-quality candidates to our highest priority positions:			
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All	N/A	My school leader and those who support recruitment and hiring consistently use updated print and online marketing materials that highlight school vision and assets, and uses these materials in outreach to candidates (e.g., job fairs):			
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All	N/A	My school has partnerships or internal structures (ie. Intern, apprenticeship programs) that consistently supply effective teachers:			
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
A rigorous interview process, as early as possible in the district's hiring cycle, guides hiring and assignment decisions, and includes demonstration lessons, faculty interviews and reference checks.	All	N/A	Hiring decisions are made:			
			After other area schools—all positions are not filled until after school begins.	After the end of the previous school year, but all positions are filled before the start of the year.	Before the end of the previous school year.	By mid-spring of the previous school year.
	All	N/A	Regarding an interview process that includes a) demonstration lessons b) faculty interviews and c) reference checks, my school:			
			Less than 49%	Includes at least one of these components.	Includes at least two of these components, including demonstration lessons.	Includes all these components for every teacher candidate.
	All	N/A	New hires are selected based on their belief in the school's core values and practices and ability to fill missing instructional content and skill gaps in teaching teams:			
			Never or almost never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Staff assignment is based on the school's needs and individuals strengths.	All	Teacher Inventory	In high-priority areas, the percentage of teachers who are effective or highly effective is approximately:			
			Less than 25%	Between 25-50%	Between 50-75%	Between 75-100%
	All	Teacher Inventory	Teachers are assigned to specialized roles according to their strengths:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Often	Always

TALENT MANAGEMENT AND TEACHER LEADERSHIP

Practice	School Level	Data Source	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	20/20 Practice
Clear lines of supervision support the growth and development of all staff members.	All	Org Chart	The supervision structure clearly documents each person's direct supervisor, who is accountable for his/her growth and development:			
			For no staff members	For a few staff members	For some staff	For all staff
	All	Org Chart	Each staff member's job responsibilities are clearly documented and updated as needed:			
			For no staff members	For a few staff members	For some staff	For all staff
	All	Org Chart	The supervision structure ensures each supervisor's span of review (i.e., number of people he/she is responsible for supporting) is no more than 12 to 1:			
			For no supervisors	For some supervisors	For most supervisors	For all supervisors
Teacher leader roles extend the reach and support the retention of highly effective teachers.	All	N/A	Teacher leader roles include different position descriptions, clear selection criteria (e.g. content expertise) and processes, as well as accountability systems:			
			Never or almost never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
	All	N/A	Roles for highly effective teachers offer meaningful opportunities to extend their reach, including coaching other teachers, facilitating collaborative planning time, refining curriculum and/or leading professional development:			
			Rarely or never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
	All	N/A	The compensation and/or additional time provided to teacher leaders matches the responsibilities for which they are accountable:			
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All	Teacher Inventory	The teachers that teacher leaders directly support have high or improving student performance outcomes:			
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All	Teacher Inventory	High performing teachers are more likely to stay at my school because they have access to leadership roles:			
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Clear and fair evaluation processes accurately recognize and support the retention of the most effective teachers as well as the persistent exit of low-performers.	All	N/A	Teachers who chronically underperform are exited efficiently through fair evaluations:			
			Never or almost never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
					OVERALL SCORE	