QM Principal Preparation Partnership Self-Assessment:

Texas Residency Version

|  |
| --- |
| **Rating Scale**  |
| 1. **Not Started**
 | Partnership has not yet been attended to in a meaningful way. |
| 1. **Planning**
 | Partners have evidence of intended steps and/or collaborative thinking but little or no evidence that the indicator is currently practiced. |
| 1. **Practicing**
 | Partners have evidence that the indicator is inconsistently practiced or partially in place. |
| 1. **Established**
 | Partners have evidence that the indicator is consistently practiced or fully in place. |
| 1. **Institutionalized**
 | Partners have evidence that the indicator is institutionalized. |

**Rating Scale:** 1= Not Started 2= Planning 3= Practicing 4= Established 5=Institutionalized

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 1: Partnership Vision |
| **Indicator** | **Rating** | **What evidence did you use to rate this indicator?** | **Why did you select this rating?** | **What are some possible next steps for strengthening this dimension?** |
| 1a. Partners have an explicit, shared vision of what an effective principal knows and is able to do, which reflects local community needs and characteristics.  |  |  |  |  |
| 1b. Partners have an explicit, shared vision of the components of an effective principal preparation program.  |  |  |  |
| 1c. Partners have an explicit, shared understanding of the purpose and value of their collaboration.  |  |  |  |
| 1d. Partners articulate clear, measurable goals and establish metrics for measuring progress.  |  |  |  |

**Rating Scale:** 1= Not Started 2= Planning 3= Practicing 4= Established 5=Institutionalized

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 2: Shared Program Leadership |
| **Indicator** | **Rating** | **What evidence did you use to rate this indicator?** | **Why did you select this rating?** | **What are some possible next steps for strengthening this dimension?** |
| 2a. Partners co-develop recruitment priorities and plans and jointly participate in recruitment.  |  |  |  |  |
| 2b. Partners collaboratively develop program selection criteria and jointly participate in candidate selection. |  |  |  |
| 2c. Partners collaborate on the design and delivery of coursework.  |  |  |  |
| 2d. Partners co-design the clinical experience and collaborate on the support of principal candidates. |  |  |  |
| 2e. Partners regularly communicate about candidate progress and support. |  |  |  |

**Rating Scale:** 1= Not Started 2= Planning 3= Practicing 4= Established 5=Institutionalized

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 3: Partnership Infrastructure |
| **Indicator** | **Rating** | **What evidence did you use to rate this indicator?** | **Why did you select this rating?** | **What are some possible next steps for strengthening this dimension?** |
| 3a. Partners have clear processes for shared decision making that include ample input from each partner organization. |  |  |  |  |
| 3b. Partners regularly communicate through defined structures and routines.  |  |  |  |
| 3c. Partners have clearly defined roles and responsibilities.  |  |  |  |
| 3d. Partners have systems, structures, and routines to support collaboration.  |  |  |  |
| 3e. Partners have sufficient resources (financial, time, and staffing) to lead and manage the program. |  |  |  |

**Rating Scale:** 1= Not Started 2= Planning 3= Practicing 4= Established 5=Institutionalized

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 4: Continuous Improvement and Progress Tracking |
| **Indicator** | **Rating** | **What evidence did you use to rate this indicator?** | **Why did you select this rating?** | **What are some possible next steps for strengthening this dimension?** |
| 4a. Partners have created the infrastructure for collecting and sharing data relevant to the partnership. |  |  |  |  |
| 4b. Partners regularly engage in collaborative data analysis related to district needs, program quality, candidate progress, and the success of graduates in the field.    |  |  |  |
| 4c. Partners apply findings from data for continuous improvement. |  |  |  |

**Rating Scale:** 1= Not Started 2= Planning 3= Practicing 4= Established 5=Institutionalized

|  |
| --- |
| Dimension 5: Partnership Sustainability, Alignment, and Integration |
| **Indicator** | **Rating** | **What evidence did you use to rate this indicator?** | **Why did you select this rating?** | **What are some possible next steps for strengthening this dimension?** |
| 5a. Partners have an articulated transition plan for role turnover.  |  |  |  |  |
| 5b. Partners have adequate funding to sustain the partnership’s needs. |  |  |  |
| 5c. Partners engage institutional leaders to support partnership goals and sustainability. |  |  |  |
| 5d. Partners update and maintain a shared partnership vision to reflect current local community needs.   |  |  |  |
| 5e. Partners align the residency content with in-service professional development for school leaders and district performance evaluation to ensure a consistent leadership vision across the developmental continuum.  |  |  |  |

Reflection and Action Planning

|  |
| --- |
| **Understanding Strengths and Challenges** |
| What dimension(s) are the greatest strengths for your partnership? |  |
| What dimension(s) do you most want to improve? |  |
| What barriers and challenges are you facing in your areas for improvement? |  |
| How might you address these barriers and challenges? What are potential solutions? |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Prioritizing Areas of Focus** |
| Which of the strategies/solutions brainstormed have the potential to be most impactful? |  |
| What level of effort will it take to implement each strategy/solution? |  |
| What resources are required to implement these ideas? |  |
| Considering capacity constraints, which ideas do you want to implement now? Which will you save for the future? |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Action Planning** |
| *Goal* | *Action Steps* | *Person Responsible* | *Timeline* | *Indicators of Success* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |