Principal to Teacher Feedback – System Elements Map

Culture	Resources	Stakeholders	Structures	Processes
What culture within our district or school might support or hinder principals from providing teachers with quality feedback?	What resources do we currently use that will either support or hinder our vision for success? Our principal's ability to provide feedback?	Which stakeholders need to be most engaged? Which will most likely be champions of this strategy? Who do we need to get on board?	What structures exist that can support principal feedback? What structures exist that might hinder principal feedback?	What processes exist that can support principal feedback? What processes exist that might hinder principal feedback?
Response:	Response:	Response:	Response:	Response:

Mitigating Risks

Structures and process to support capacity in the work (coaching capacity, teacher leaders, etc.)	Culture, mindset, and beliefs about materials
Considering the stakeholders across the whole system (administrators, central office, teachers)	Culture, mindset, and beliefs about student knowledge and skills

Common challenges	Ways to anticipate and support leaders through these challenges
Structures and process to support capacity in the work (coaching capacity, teacher leaders, etc.)	
A newer principal with delegation challenges has trouble finding time to complete walkthroughs consistently and/or effectively, which in turn leads to little buy-in from teachers.	
Structures or processes for lesson planning result in mixed messages around vision for high-quality instruction with high-quality materials.	
Previously required lesson plan templates don't support the use of the materials and result in teachers making major adaptations to the lessons and lesson sequences.	
Schedules for class time don't support the strong use of the materials (e.g., 50-minute literacy block, materials require 70 minutes daily).	
Culture, mindset, and beliefs about materials, *plus* culture, mindset, and beliefs about student knowledge and skills	
There is the usual and expected struggle of teachers attempting HQIM for the first time and finding it difficult to maintain pace/use all aspects of the materials provided, which will lead to the need for support around sub-indicators (1C, 1B, 2A, 2C) in implementation phase 1. ● Potential concerns you will hear: 　○ Lessons are 'too long' 　○ Too many, too complex questions 　○ My kids can't do this level of work yet; how do I change/scaffold?	
District focuses exclusively on strict fidelity to curriculum, which leaves a lack of attention on student engagement/Core Action 3 and other student needs (e.g., appropriate scaffolds and adapting the lesson based on student understanding; 3E, 3F).	

Leadership belief that effective teachers make adaptations to curriculum and source their own materials leads to teachers replacing much of the core curriculum with supplemental materials.	
Considering the stakeholders across the whole system (administrators, central office, teachers)	
Lack of understanding of other instructional leaders beyond the principal results in mixed messages to teachers from those most directly supporting them.	
A school with 'good' results has challenges creating buy-in for 'hassling' teachers with new materials.	
A school with a largely seasoned staff struggles with faculty questioning the need for new practices.	
A school with largely new/very transient staff has trouble getting new initiatives off the ground because teachers are already overwhelmed.	
Teachers are frustrated that they don't understand the tool (IPG) that principals are using to provide them with feedback.	
A school with significant challenges creating a culture of learning feels like the IPG isn't directly addressing the primary concerns in the classroom; administrators don't know how to coach teachers to shift to Core Action 3 in management-challenged classrooms.	