Each month, school leaders plan out specific, detailed actions steps/tasks they want to accomplish toward their Roadmap goals in the upcoming weeks. Leaders refer back to the Effective Schools Framework to include effective school practices across all five domains (vision, culture, leadership, instruction, and systems). For each action step and the tasks/steps within the action step, leaders identify specific data sources or artifacts that will support and/or be used to monitor implementation.

For example, an artifact might be monthly observation and feedback tracking logs from the reading coach and lead teacher looking for increased student engagement.

Teacher data might include a monthly aggregation of the student engagement learning walks and data discussed with teams and whole school.

Student data might include how the 8th graders performed on a unit test.

What are some “how to” steps you can take for this action?
How do you…?  What else…?
How do you…?  What else…?
How do you…?  What else…?

What barriers do you anticipate? What will you do to address these barriers?
What resources/tools do you need to identify or develop to support your action and “how to” steps?
What artifacts can you bring to the next meeting to document implementation of this action? How will those artifacts demonstrate the depth and impact of implementation? How will you be sure?
What progress monitoring data will demonstrate the effectiveness of the action step?
In which domains does the action primarily fall in? How can you alter this action to raise level of performance within the domain?

One suggestion I have is…
I wonder what would happen if…?
One approach that has worked well for me…
In which domains does the action primarily fall in? How can you alter this action to raise the level of performance within the domain?
# Criteria for a Quality Tactic/Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit Connection to Theory of Change</th>
<th>The tactic logically flows from the Theory of Change and has implications for student, teacher, and leader impacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describes Leader’s Role</td>
<td>From reading the tactic, it is clear that the leader (principal) has a primary responsibility for enacting the work. This is true even in cases where others may be involved or have large roles within the action. One can make an inference from reading the tactic how it will influence the work of educators in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to Impact on Instructional Core</td>
<td>The description of the tactic explains how the action will impact a relationship between teachers, students, and content relevant to the student learning goals identified in the Roadmap. The tactic is ideally related to a problem of practice that reflects an immediate priority relevant to the Theory of Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Goldilocks-size&quot; for Month Interval</td>
<td>The tactic is the right grain size for a month’s efforts. It is neither too overwhelming to be impossible to do in four weeks and it is not such a light lift that the impact on the instructional core would be negligible. Three to six hours a week would be a typical range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifies How Success Defined and Measure</td>
<td>A reasonable person could read the tactic success measures and know what information would be required to determine whether or not the tactic was implemented and if it met the desired outcomes. The leader has a plan for collecting the necessary information and can do so within the time constraints of other competing priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Upon Previous Learning and Actions</td>
<td>After the first month, tactics are designed to continue the work of previous months in a way that builds scale (depth, spread, sustainability, evolution of concept). This can also include shifting to new priorities based upon the impact or lack thereof for the current theory of change and tactics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GPS: LOOKING BACK TEMPLATE AND PROTOCOL

Monthly reflection on the actions implemented since the last network meeting.

Each month, school leaders reflect on the Roadmap action steps planned at the previous meeting. Members share the status of each action step and whether it was achieved, is still in process, or had no action taken.

Using the Looking Back-Coaching and Accountability Questions (see right) peers ask each other a series of reflection questions to share the outcomes of their actions and provide supporting details on evidence of change in the form of data (teacher or student) or artifacts. In other words, network members are accountable to each other for their planned action steps.

The Looking Back Protocol discussion often generates “next steps” for the upcoming month.

**Peer Coaching and Accountability Questions**

**GOAL**

With respect to your actions and progress since our last meeting, what feedback would you like to get from this conversation? What coaching questions do you want to focus on?

**REALITY**

What specific actions have you taken since the last session?

In which ESF domain(s) were your actions primarily? At what level of the rubric did you see evidence of the school practices you were driving towards?

What artifacts from your action steps do you have to share?

What outcomes or data do you have towards your Roadmap? How confident are you about your conclusions about the data?

**OPTIONS**

What are some possible modifications you could make to address obstacles?

What actions can you take to move your school practices to higher levels in your domain(s) of focus?

**SUPPORT**

One suggestion I have is…

I wonder what would happen if…

Something I’ve tried with success on my campus…