Figure 5.3: Student Achievement Leadership Rubric

1—Not Meeting Standards, 2—Progressing (Leadership Potential), 3—Proficient (Local Impact), 4—Exemplary (Systemwide Impact)	
1. Planning and goal setting for student achievement	
4	• The leader routinely shares specific leadership, teaching, and curriculum strategies that are associated with improved student achievement. • Other leaders in the system credit the leader with sharing ideas, coaching teachers and leaders, and providing technical assistance to implement successful new initiatives.
3	• The leader's student achievement goals and strategies reflect a clear relationship between teachers' and other leaders' actions and student achievement. • Results show steady improvements based on these leadership initiatives.
2	• The leader has established specific and measurable student achievement goals, but these efforts have yet to result in improved student achievement.
1	• The leader's student achievement goals are neither measurable nor specific. The leader focuses more on student characteristics than on the actions of the teachers and leaders in the system.
2. Student achievement results	
4	• The leader has a consistent record of improved student achievement on multiple indicators of student success. • Student success occurs not only overall but also in each group of historically disadvantaged students. • Data indicate that the leader has improved student performance. • In areas of previous success, the leader aggressively identifies new challenges, moving proficient performance to the exemplary level. • Where new challenges emerge, the leader highlights the need, creates effective intervention, and reports improved results.
3	• The leader hits the numbers, meeting student performance goals. • The student population average improves, as does the achievement of each group of students whose data have previously identified as needing improvement.
2	• The leader has some evidence of improvement, but insufficient evidence of changes in leadership, teaching, and curriculum that will create the improvements necessary to achieve student performance goals.
1	• Indifferent to the data, the leader blames students, families, and external characteristics for student achievement. • The leader does not believe that student achievement can improve. • The leader has not taken decisive action to change schedules, teacher assignments, curriculum, leadership practices, or other variables in order to improve student achievement.

3.	Student achievement reporting to students, parents, teachers, and other leaders
4	• Reports at all levels extend far beyond the report card and include standards achievement reports, detailing student performance on the most important standards. These reports include power standards, which teachers identify as most related to student performance at the next instructional level. • Faculty meetings and professional development meetings focus on the locally produced academic reports, and clear evidence shows changes in leadership, teaching, and curriculum in response to these analyses. • Leaders can produce academic achievement reports at any time, and for students who require particular assistance, they increase the frequency of academic achievement reporting.
3	• Student achievement reports include not only traditional report cards and grades but also standards achievement reports, detailing student performance on standards, as part of each reporting period.
2	• The school delivers required report cards in a timely and accurate manner. • Faculty members and administrators can explain the relationship between grades and standards where required.
1	• The school provides standard report cards with letter grades. • Any relationship between grades and standards is a matter of the teacher's individual discretion.
4.	Use of student achievement data to make instructional leadership decisions
4	• Clear evidence shows that the leader has used state or provincial, district, building, and classroom data to make specific and observable changes in teaching, curriculum, and leadership. • The leader regularly shares with other leaders and teachers both successes and failures based on local data analysis. • The leader makes a data wall the focal point of both formal and informal leadership and faculty discussions.
3	• Clear evidence shows that the leader has made changes in curriculum, teaching, and leadership based on data. • The leader has a data wall, and both the leader and teachers refer to it in order to inform instructional decisions.
2	• The leader participates in data-driven decision-making workshops, but limited evidence shows that the leader has made data-based changes.
1	• The leader is indifferent to data and makes no changes in scheduling, instruction, curriculum, or leadership compared with the previous year. • The data scream, "Change!" and the leader's actions say, "Everything is just fine."

5.	**Understanding of student requirements and academic standards**
4	• Faculty members use the power standards and share them with faculty members in other buildings. • Every faculty meeting and staff development forum focuses on student achievement, including reviews of individual student's work compared with standards.
3	• The leader has analyzed each academic standard and translated it into student-accessible language. • Faculty members widely share power standards and make them visible throughout the building. • The leader makes the link between standards and student performance evident by posting proficient student work throughout the building.
2	• The leader has posted standards. • The leader has conducted the required training.
1	• The leader leaves classroom curriculum as a matter of individual discretion. • The leader hesitates to intrude on or is indifferent to classroom decisions that vary from academic standards' requirements.

6.	**Understanding of student performance levels based on consistent assessments that reflect local and state or provincial academic standards**
4	• Evidence shows that the leader has made decisive changes in teacher assignments and curriculum based on student performance data. • The leader widely shares case studies of effective and ineffective decisions with other leaders and throughout the district.
3	• Evidence shows that the leader has made specific changes based on student performance data.
2	• The leader is aware of the need to change, but he or she has not yet implemented changes.
1	• The leader is indifferent to the need for change—unable or unwilling to make difficult decisions.

7.	**Decisions in teacher assignment, course content, scheduling, and student curriculum based on specific student achievement needs**
4	• The leader uses multiple data sources, including state or provincial, district, school, and classroom assessments, and has at least three years of data. • The leader systematically examines data at the subscale level to find strengths and challenges. • The leader empowers teaching and administrative staff to draw inferences from data. • Data insights are regularly the subject of faculty meetings and professional development sessions. • The leader can specifically document examples of data-based decisions in teacher assignment, curriculum, assessment, and intervention. • The leader has coached leaders in other schools to improve their data-analysis skills.

3	• The leader uses multiple data sources, including state or provincial and district assessments, and has at least two years of data. • The leader systematically examines data at the subscale level to find strengths and challenges. • The leader can specifically document examples of data-based decisions in teacher assignment, curriculum, assessment, and intervention.
2	• The leader is aware of state or provincial and district results and has discussed those results with staff, but has not linked specific decisions to the data.
1	• The leader is unaware of or indifferent to the data.