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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Principal Roles in DPS
In implementing LEAP, Denver Public School’s new teacher evaluation system, the district is faced with how to manage the competing demands for DPS principal time to fulfill their dual roles as school-based managers AND instructional leaders. As a school system, DPS has adopted a theory of action of managed performance empowerment that holds school leaders accountable for reaching clearly defined student outcomes but aims to devolve significant principal control over operations and the resources and strategy around the instructional core. In this vision, a DPS principal manages the budget and operations as they relate to the instructional core and acts as the school’s instructional leader, observing, evaluating, coaching, and working closely with teams of teachers to improve instruction.

Understanding Principal Time
Concern over the many demands on principal time that compete with instructional leadership prompted the district to take a closer look at how principals spend their days. DPS asked Education Resource Strategies to conduct analysis to understand how Denver principals use time and what they perceive as helpful and burdensome to identify ways of; 1) reducing the administrative burden on principals and 2) organizing time and resources to support more effective instructional leadership. Focus groups with 22 principal volunteers, interviews with three Instructional Superintendents and seven HR school business partners, and a time-use study that involved day-long shadowing of 22 DPS principals, representing a range of experience and school sizes, levels, and types, produced these initial findings:

- Although control over daily operations gives principals flexibility in organizing and running their schools, these non-instructional duties take time away from academic leadership.
  - Principals currently spend approximately half of their time on tasks related to organizational leadership (i.e., managing budgets, staff, scheduling, hiring, and district requests) and day-to-day operations (i.e., facilities, safety, discipline, attendance, student services, and compliance) with a wide degree of individual variation for these two time categories (4%-61%).
  - Only about 17% of principal time is spent in instructional leadership (i.e., observing classes, providing feedback, using data to inform instruction, leading planning sessions/ professional development and developing the instructional program) with the degree of variation on the given days of shadowing ranging from 0% to 44%.

- While steps are being taken to streamline district communications and processes, principals feel inundated by the volume of Central office meetings, requests, and initiatives.

- Implementing LEAP will further increase demands on principal time, requiring on average an estimated 40 minutes per day or 8% of a principal’s school time; given experience in other districts that are shifting from traditional, compliance-driven systems to more robust and strategic instruments like LEAP, DPS should expect a tripling of the demands on principal time compared to the old system.

1 Note: Please see more detail on the methods used in Appendix A. Given the small sample size with shadowing of only 22 principals, or approximately 15% of the district, DPS might consider further investigation of these trends with a larger sample if findings do not seem consistent with district understanding and experience.
• Other areas in which principals spend significant time that might otherwise be focused on improving instruction include:
  - Screening potential hires
  - The administrative aspects of dismissing unqualified teachers
  - Reconciling budget and performance data
  - Compiling data from un-integrated systems and sources for meetings and reporting
  - Managing facilities
  - Recruiting and enrolling new students

Recommendations

Based on these initial observations, ERS recommends the following actions by DPS:

1. Define principal responsibilities to enhance and clarify instructional leadership role and improve organizational leadership as it relates to the academic mission of schools
   - Incorporate changes into current Executive Cabinet discussions aimed at devolving versus centralizing functions through student based budgeting.
2. Centralize and streamline certain functions that distract principals from their job as instructional leaders and empowered organizational leaders
3. Coordinate communications and prioritize requests across district departments
4. Provide principals with guidelines, templates, training, and best practices for effective time allocation
5. Ensure that principals have access to and models for high-quality administrative support
THE RESEARCH ON PRINCIPAL ROLES AND STUDENT OUTCOMES

There is limited research on how principals spend their time, making it difficult to draw causal relationships between principal roles and student outcomes. Although inconclusive, several studies present the case that for the time being DPS should invest in strengthening instructional leadership and organizational leadership, while minimizing the daily administrative tasks of principals that do not directly contribute to the instructional mission and core.

Horng, Klasik & Loeb’s study was the most comprehensive, despite acknowledging limitations and cautioning against over-interpreting results. The researchers observed that principals in low-performing schools spent more time on administration while principals at high-performing schools spent more time on instructional leadership/day-to-day instruction (i.e., formal and informal class observations, facilitating professional development and using data to inform instruction.) However, the study was unable to demonstrate a causal link between principal time spent on instructional leadership/day-to-day instruction and gains in student performance. High-growth school principals spent more time on organizational leadership compared to administration. The study authors suggest that organizational leadership activities, such as good hiring decisions and managing budgets, help set a positive tone for the whole school.  

Another recent study, The Missing Link in School Reform, picks up on the importance of good organizational leadership in ensuring the right conditions for teaching effectiveness, specifically collaboration and the creation of “social capital” among staff. Rather than principal as instructional mentor or monitor, the study stresses the role of facilitator, garnering resources to support time, space, and staffing to enhance teacher relationships and collaboration. While neither study is definitive, they de-emphasize daily administration while suggesting instructional leadership and organizational leadership as roles to strengthen, support and investigate in more depth.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND RELATED FINDINGS

Recommendation 1: Define principal responsibilities to enhance and clarify instructional leadership role and improve organizational leadership as it relates to the academic mission of schools.

Related Findings:
Although there is wide variation between individual principals, when we observe DPS principal time in aggregate, it is consumed by Organizational Leadership and Day-to-Day Operations with little time in areas related to Instructional Leadership.

- 25% in Organizational Leadership (Managing budget, staff, schedule, resources)
- 24% in Day-to-Day Operations (daily administrative tasks like facilities, attendance, discipline) but only
- 17% spent in Instructional Leadership (observations, evaluations, facilitating PD, using data to inform instruction, developing the instructional program)

Table 1: DPS Principal Shadowing Time Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Day-to-Day Operations</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Instructional Leadership*</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Day-to-Day Instruction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fostering Internal Relationships</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Fostering External Relationships</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Additional Tasks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Work Hours</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of time spent by location, reflects these same trends in DPS principal time use, with 49% spent in their offices as opposed to 13% in the classroom. (See Appendix E, Table 1)

Interestingly, the overall averages are strikingly similar to what Horng et al found in shadowing 65 Miami-Dade principals, although Horng’s study captured just the school day as opposed to the entire work day in DPS and Miami-Dade spent even less principal time in Instructional Leadership— only 13% versus DPS’s 19%. Minor differences in the coding schemes as we adapted Horng et al methodology for DPS account for most of this difference.

*Note: We have altered Horng et al’s coding scheme for our DPS analysis. We combined Instructional Program Development with the observing, evaluating, coaching, and professional development aspects of Day-to-Day Instruction to form the category we call “Instructional Leadership.” What remains in Day-To-Day Instruction is Teaching Students, Directing supplementary instruction, and Fulfilling SPED requirements. Please see Appendices A & B for the details of what is included in each category.

*In Table 2 Instructional Leadership combines the categories Instructional Program Development and Day-to-Day Instruction. (See Appendices A & B for more detail.) DPS’s instructional leadership is slightly higher in Table 2.
Table 2: DPS Principal Shadowing Time Use vs. Miami-Dade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DPS</th>
<th>Miami-Dade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Day-to-Day Operations</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Instructional Leadership/Day to Day Instruction</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Fostering Internal Relationships</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fostering External Relationships</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Additional Tasks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we consider these time allocations, it is important to recognize the wide range among individual principals, where some principals spent no time on Instructional Leadership, while others spent close to 60%. We could not identify discernible differences in time spent on instructional leadership based on the number of teachers, level of schooling or experience of the principal that explained the variation. The differences could be driven by such factors as principal expertise, perception of their role and priorities, how they plan their day, the level of administrative support, or even circumstances on the particular day.

We also found wide variation in the time that principals spend on day-to-day operations including activities like managing student discipline, supervising students as a scheduled daily activity, managing personal or school schedule, and fulfilling compliance requirements (not including special ed). In this area, though the sample is small, we found that principals in smaller schools spent significantly more time than principals of larger schools of 600 students and above. On average principals in schools with less than 600 students spend 60 minutes more time on day-to-day operations. This runs counter to some theories which suggest that principals of small schools might have more time to devote to instructional leadership because they have fewer teachers to support and develop. However, principals of small schools also have less operational support in the form of Assistant Principals (1.8 to .8), secretaries (4.3 to 2.7) or even other teacher leaders (2.7 to 1.5). Altogether, large school principals have an average of 8.8 additional administrators/front office staff, compared to 5 additional administrators in smaller schools.

Other Data for Consideration

Although we have highlighted three major time categories related to Instructional Leadership, Organizational Leadership, and Day-To-Day Operations, we should consider other principal uses of time. About 10% of principal time is spent fostering internal relationships and external relationships, respectively. This is worth noting, given the potential importance of social capital - teacher relationships and collaboration – in the context of reform. Less than 5% of time went to instructional program development (reviewing curriculum and textbooks, developing and educational program across the school, planning the year’s professional development approach). Given that it was March and just before or after testing, it is not surprising that principals were devoting so little time to instructional program development. The remainder of principal time (13%) was spent on additional tasks such as transition between activities, paperwork, email, and phone calls.

compared to Table 1 (19% vs. 17%) since Table 2 includes Teaching Students, Directing supplementary instruction and Fulfilling SPED requirements in Instructional Leadership, whereas those categories are separated out into Day-to-Day Instruction in Table 1.
Focus Groups

Principal focus groups support these time use trends with anecdotes of instructional leadership being way-laid by daily administrative tasks, as principals wear a variety of hats. Without a clear outline and prioritization of principal responsibilities, in a work-day that averages 11 hours, but can span from 8 to 15 hours, principals find themselves doing everything from screening job candidates and compiling and reconciling school-based data to responding to central office emails, requests, and initiatives. In remarking on participation on district initiatives, one principal remarked, “It’s all good, but it’s too much all at once, it’s hard to know what the priorities are, and sometimes we just can’t figure out how all these things relate. I can’t do everything at once; it can be overwhelming.”

These varied and unspecified responsibilities are particularly problematic in light of the increased time requirements that LEAP will place on most DPS principals. A school by school analysis by ERS suggests that on average principals or assistant principals, where they exist, will need to devote 40 daily minutes or 8% of the school year on observations, evaluations, feedback, and follow-up specified by LEAP.

While time spent on the evaluation system isn’t evenly spread across each day/week of the school year, it’s important to note that on the day of the observations, only 8 of the 22 DPS principals that we studies spent any time on formal evaluation, averaging only 17 minutes. That is one third of the time that all principals would need to spend to complete the LEAP observation process. (See Appendix E, Table 2)

The need for well-defined principal roles ties closely with current work by the Executive Cabinet, as members refine the Student-Based Budgeting System, revisit what elements should and should not fall under school control, and strive for balance between school control and central efficiencies. To avoid the fragmented approaches of individual department decisions, it is particularly important for DPS to manage these conversations as part of a comprehensive approach with all stakeholders participating.

**Recommendation 2:** Centralize and streamline responsibilities and functions that distract principals from their job as instructional and organizational leaders.

**Related Findings:**

In focus groups, principals highlight a variety of activities and responsibilities that generate significant time burdens. Specific areas discussed are: hiring, dismissal, HR support, budgeting, data management, student service placement, facilities management, and student recruitment/enrollment. Some of these areas may warrant centralization if Central Office capacity and resource levels allow. Principals are more likely to want to relinquish control in areas they perceive as well-managed by the district. Other areas may require better integration and coordination of processes, systems and departments. As we address each area below, we include the perceptions and suggestions of principals as well as ERS’s additional suggestions.

**HIRING:** Prescreen job candidates for baseline eligibility; Increase human resources staffing if necessary

Human Resource staff reports that it does not currently pre-screen candidates because of the volume of candidates, the time involved (the HR team is small), and the inefficiency of pre-screening applicants in which principals may not be interested. However, it is a significant burden for principals to screen selected candidate qualifications themselves (or risk losing a favorite candidate who they later learn does not have the right credentials), and also redundant, since multiple principals might be screening the same candidate.
Principals felt that it would save them considerable time and frustration if HR pre-screened applicants for baseline qualifications before putting their names on the candidate list.

**Additional Suggestions:** In addition to the possibility of investing resources in HR so that screening could be centralized, clarifying what HR currently does and does not screen for, along with principal training on how to screen, might help alleviate some of the frustration if not the time burden. In addition, the district could ask candidates to upload copies of their certificates to streamline the application process.

**TEACHER DISMISSAL:** Streamline the teacher dismissal process, through increased HR support and/or contract renegotiation.

Principals cite the teacher documentation and dismissal process as one of the roles they would most like to change. Although principals found HR supportive when firing a teacher, they experience substantial variation in the amount and type of help they get on teacher dismissal.

**Additional Suggestions:** The teacher dismissal process is an area where a renegotiated union contract or additional help from HR could reduce the time burden on principals significantly. In particular, principals mention that more sample letters and documents would be helpful.

**HR SUPPORT:** As we consider hiring and dismissal, it is important to consider the Human Resources department as a provider of resources, expertise, and support. Focus group participants report different levels of satisfaction with the support they received from their HR contacts. Some report that their HR partners are highly responsive and save them substantial amounts of time, while others experience the opposite. High HR partner turnover has required that some principals devote extra time to help new partners learn the school context.

**Additional Suggestions:** The responsiveness of HR staff is a function of both their capabilities and their school load. The HR department may want to consider whether additional training would be helpful in some cases, and whether they have an effective staffing ratio. Currently HR support staff serve up 20 schools.

**Other HR issues:** Additional time drains for principals include scheduling new hire orientations, attending the hiring fair even if the school isn’t hiring, and navigating hiring constraints that vary by school type and status. DPS may wish to provide clarification and support in these areas.

**BUDGETING:** Reduce budget-tracking burdens by frequently updating and verifying funding information and offering additional administrative support for under-staffed or small schools.

In general, the two-week budget and staffing process works well for principals. Most feel supported, appreciating the Budget Department’s optional “budget refresher” meetings. However, principals at small elementary schools are burdened by budget tracking issues. The problems appear to be related to inaccurate account data and not enough administrative staff to easily reconcile the discrepancies. Small elementary school principals have “a lack of faith in budget office records,” citing two-month old budget information, long processing time for the budget office, overcharge reconciliations not occurring until June, and a lot of account errors. Principals state:
Believing that their information is not accurate and up-to-date, principals spend a lot of time maintaining their own duplicate tracking systems. Uncertainty about funding levels and changes in funding can mean frequent budget revisions. Because principals do not always know their full allocated amount up front they have a hard time budgeting as effectively as they might otherwise. In addition, principals spend unnecessary time navigating forms and regulations. The credit card process feels especially cumbersome and arcane.

**Additional Suggestions:** Encourage small schools to share school business manager positions; if five schools shared a position, each could have a day a week of budget support at an affordable cost. Consider creating a district-support position like Houston Public Schools has to support principals. In this model, the district defines the job description clearly, screens, selects and trains candidates which then become available to principals. The district organizes ongoing training and support for these individuals. Communicate accurate and timely budget information to individual schools, so principals don’t feel the need to duplicate and correct Central efforts.

**DATA MANAGEMENT:** Improve data tools, reporting features, accuracy, and error reporting systems.

Principals report that it can be quite time-consuming to pull together data required for meetings or reports, that navigating the data interfaces could be “clunky” and that the different data systems “don’t always talk to each other.” Principals are inundated with stacks of information, and while some of the reports are quite good it can be hard to absorb them all. Some principals also said they spend considerable time reviewing high stakes data reports, verifying and correcting inaccuracies, which sometimes take repeated follow-up.

The central office is already working to address some of these issues: one of the goals for this coming year is to have the monthly Continuous Improvement Guide (CIG) report generated for principals, rather than having them pull the data themselves from multiple sources.

**STUDENT SERVICE PLACEMENT:** Assess the student services department processes and determine if there is a way to improve student placement.

Principals report that getting appropriate student placements in a timely way is challenging and requires multiple follow-ups. In the meantime, they often devote large amounts of time to managing issues related to the students who need placements. Principals say that their interactions with the student services office often feels compliance-based rather than service based. Unlike with the budget and HR offices, they lack personal relationships with the student services staff, which may be a contributing factor to the difficulties of placing students. According to one principal, “I don’t know who any of those people are.” Principals also report that discipline data entry is particularly time-consuming.

**FACILITIES MANAGEMENT:** Improve systems for requesting, defining, and overseeing facilities projects, clarifying responsibilities and timelines.

Principals reported mixed experiences with Facilities Management. Some felt that their “Top 3” list of repairs languished and required too much oversight on their part to make it happen. Another complaint was that there were either too many meeting requests or not enough communication when maintenance projects like
painting, replacing windows, or major building repairs were underway. Other principals did not report any time burden issues with facilities management.

**STUDENT RECRUITMENT & ENROLLMENT:** Consider centralizing some of the student enrollment activities to improve information and access and use economies of scale where possible.

Some schools devote substantial amounts of time to managing the student enrollment process (helping parents fill out applications, answering their questions about the process, scanning in applications, working on wait lists, contacting accepted students, calling students who fail to register, etc). These sorts of services are typically centralized in most districts, due to economies of scale and a desire to make sure that all parents have equal access to accurate information. DPS is already moving to align application deadlines for traditional, magnet and charter schools, and improve information sharing so that principals can better predict yield rates. The district may also want to consider instituting regional parent information centers in order to remove at least some of the student enrollment operation burden from principals. Some principals are reluctant to cede control of this however, being skeptical that the central office will serve parents well, so quality assurances would be necessary.

**Other Issues**

**Transportation and the Department of Technology (DOT):** Principals said that Transportation and DOT have improved over the last couple years and did not have any time burdens to report about these departments (ironically, the only complaint about DOT was too many customer satisfaction surveys, some sent out before the work had been completed).

**Grants:** Applying for and fulfilling grant reporting requirements was a substantial burden in some schools, particularly schools with fewer administrators.

**Community interactions:** Principals reported spending significant amounts of time working with their CSCs; depending on the school context, some found this more valuable than others. Principals also identified the parent survey as a particularly time-consuming mandate, and were particularly frustrated that they were evaluated on a specific cut-off point for response rate (some principals felt that a high response rate was out of their control, no matter what incentives or systems they created).

**Recommendation 3:** Coordinate communications and prioritize requests across district departments

**Related Findings:**

Principals and central office staff alike report that departments tend to be in their own silos and that communication does not flow as freely as it should across realms. In the words of one respondent, “Sometimes it feels like the right hand doesn’t know what the left hand is doing.” Principals are sometimes told contradictory things by different central office staff, or felt that the rules changed unexpectedly part way through the game. This fragmented approach is noted in DPS communications, district meeting requests, and involvement in system or state initiatives.

**COMMUNICATIONS:** Re-establish gatekeeper to differentiate and reduce communications. Reduce demands on principals by coordinating requests across departments via a centralized calendar.

Despite the weekly central office newsletter ConnectEd, principals are inundated by emails that require significant time to glean for relevancy, especially for new principals. One interviewee reported receiving over
100 emails on the required emergency response plan. The high volume is due to the mass nature and lack of “differentiated communication” to relevant parties, and a lack of coordination between departments. Departments are not always aware of competing demands on principal time as they issued surveys, requests for data, and other mandates, sometimes asking for the same information multiple times in different formats. One principal remarked, “We get the same question three different ways from three different departments and have to answer them each in their own format. Why can’t they share information?”

Additional Suggestions: One potential solution is a central calendar that maps school activities at any given time for central departments. This could help the district office align and potentially streamline different requests to principals, and help principals better plan, delegate and prioritize. A centralized data-capture system could also help reduce redundant data requests, by mapping data needs across departments and issuing aligned requests.

DISTRICT MEETING REQUESTS: Rethink the number, purpose, and structure of district-mandated meetings (already in process) to reduce the amount of time that principals are pulled from the building. In each of the four focus groups, one of the first issues to come up when we asked about central office demands on principal time was the number and frequency of district meetings. “We’re pulled out of our buildings way too much,” stated one respondent. They listed a dozen regularly scheduled meetings. (See Appendix E: Table 3.) Principals did not share a common understanding of the purpose, structure or timing of the meetings, or which ones they were required to attend. While some of the meetings were deemed quite useful (particularly the one-on-one elementary school Instructional Superintendent meetings), more often principals were frustrated with the amount of time the meetings were taking relative to the benefit derived from them. According to one principal, “Either there’s not enough content and they pull us together just to plan, or there’s this barrage of information and we can’t figure out what the main take-aways are.”

From conversations with Instructional Superintendents, it is clear that the central office is already aware of these issues and is rethinking the meeting structure for next year.

Principal Recommendations: To avoid “meeting creep,” principals suggested that trainings and info sessions be modular and optional, depending on the level of principal experience, school type and needs.

DISTRICT AND STATE INITIATIVES: Prioritize, coordinate, and more carefully sequence the roll-out of initiatives. While principals are generally positive about current initiatives, there is concern over the sheer number, lack of differentiation, and irrelevancy for certain schools that would prefer to opt out. Multiple new projects lead to high demand from central staff for input and pressure for principals to participate on committees. Principals say they like to be involved and to give input, but that this can be “too much of a good thing.” Simultaneous project launches run the risk of creating confusion over priorities, compounded start-up costs and difficulty in effectively building one initiative off another. Little lead time between projects makes central planning and coordination before launch difficult. This can result in changes to schedules, deadlines, and rules as central adapts interpretations of goals, laws (like SB-191), draining principal time as principals are forced to sort out conflicting information and requests. Principal burnout is a risk and despite the hard work and good intentions of central staff, the stressful environment has contributed to low morale in certain groups.
THE UNIFIED IMPROVEMENT PLAN (UIP) PROCESS

The implementation of the new state UIP process posed time demands on DPS principals, as they became acquainted with the new format and expectations. The late roll-out and October deadline added pressure as principals scrambled to create their UIPs at the start of the school year. Principals received contradictory information from different sources, and turning it into a compliance rather than improvement exercise. Inconsistencies between DPS and state information and errors and incomplete data made interpreting the results and explaining them to the community difficult. One principal stated, “You can’t assume that the data is accurate, you have to check it and keep following up to get things fixed.” The mandatory community participation, meetings, and parent surveys were particularly time-consuming mandates, especially as principals attempted to yield the designated response rate. Principals were not always sure how the UIP fit in with other district initiatives such as the PCKs. On the plus side, most of the focus group principals felt that the new UIP was an improvement over the old form and that subsequent years will be easier now that they know the system.

Principal Recommendations: Focus group principals suggested several ways to improve the UIP process:

- Ensure that data reports are clear and correct
- Release data earlier so that principals can have plans ready to go at the start of the school year, rather than be working on the plan as the school year begins
- Improve communication on the process (for instance, some principals were unclear whether it was a one-year plan or a three-year plan and when the next one is due)
- Provide training on the state rubric for evaluating the UIP
- Ensure that the district support staff are themselves clear on the state rubric and the UIP process

Although much of these issues may resolve themselves with further implementation, DPS should look for ways to improve timing, information, and district support.

**Recommendation 4:** Provide principals with guidelines, training, best practices, and templates on effective time allocation.

Guidelines: As part of defining principal roles, DPS should work toward establishing guidelines for the amount of time and effort that principals should be spending on instructional leadership with variations based on the school mission and context as well as administrative resources available to the principal. Principal training could reinforce the successful adoption of such guidelines, either through sessions in effective time management around priorities or through observation.

Best Practices and Training: DPS could identify principals who are already adept at organizing time and use their expertise to build and disseminate best practices. Principals who the district considers master time users may be able to help other principals reconsider how they use time. There are a number of ways to
accomplish this. The district could arrange for novice, interested or struggling principals to shadow master time use principals for a day, to observe expert approaches. DPS could ask master time use principals to keep time diaries for a week, in order to better codify their approaches, and then have them prepare a principal PD seminar for their peers on using time. Finally, the district could encourage all principals to keep a time log for several days in order to analyze their current time use against their desired time use, launching conversations about what keeps principals from using time the way they want. It may be a matter of getting the right number and kind of support staff in the building, of training staff, of learning how to delegate, of learning what does not need to be done, of distinguishing between the important and the urgent, or of changing practices around what receives attention first. Ultimately, principals would be learning what to pursue, what to eliminate, and when to seek assistance.

**Templates:** Principals spend a lot of time reinventing the wheel. To leverage existing and successful school approaches, the central office could offer principals optional, high quality templates for standard school tasks. Items could include school website templates, student handbooks, form letters, sample HR letters, business cards, budget and data tracking spreadsheets, and forms for providing informal classroom observation feedback.

**Recommendation 5:** Ensure that principals have access to and models for high-quality administrative support.

Given the volume and diversity of demands on DPS principals, and in light of the research that raises questions about the value of principal time spend on administrative tasks, DPS needs to ensure that principals have sufficient and high-quality administrative support, especially as principals continue to juggle the organizational and instructional realms. Unfortunately, in times of budget cuts, administrative staff are often the first items on the chopping block. Although there are instances when that is appropriate, in other circumstances it can be counter-productive, leaving principals over-burdened and ineffective. DPS might consider creating the role of “school-based business manager” that can focus on the non-instructional agenda. This role should be created consistently with DPS School-Based Budgeting, not imposing positions on the school but allowing schools to choose to buy this position if needed.

The Wallace Foundation has seen promising results with its School Administration Manager (SAM) project, which frees principal time to focus on instructional leadership by helping them delegate to highly trained building managers. Even small schools can afford building managers if they are shared across schools. There are also other approaches to consider, such as paying attention to the assistant principal and school secretary pipelines and capacity, and ensuring adequate support from central office contacts.

The Instructional Superintendent role offers an opportunity for increased administrative resources. Elementary and secondary school principals seem to experience the role of the Instructional Superintendents (ISs) differently. Elementary principals are more likely to report IS visits as collaborative, problem solving, and supportive, while secondary principals report that IS meetings are longer, require substantial preparation, and are more focused on accountability and monitoring. It may be fruitful to blend the elementary and secondary IS approaches into an overall system that helps principals feel supported, know where they can turn for concrete advice, and have clear expectations for progress.
**Conclusion**

DPS’s decentralized approach to school improvement and innovation, while placing it in the hands of those best situated to address the needs of students and teachers, complicates the principal role as instructional leader. In order to address the responsibilities of school-based management, especially in light of the new LEAP program, DPS can better leverage principals to lead instructional improvement in their schools by:

- clearly outlining principal responsibilities
- removing or lessening burdensome tasks through centralization and increased efficiency,
- coordinating communication and requirements across departments and
- providing guidance and support on effective resource use and time management.

Given the degree of variation in how principals use time, along with how little exists in the literature about effective time use, this area is ripe for DPS’s further investigation and articulation. Clearly defined roles will inform the kind of principals that DPS will want to attract, train, support, and reward based on evaluations that are aligned with these new definitions. Ultimately, these actions will empower principals to be better instructional leaders, savvy managers of people, time, dollars, and technology, and stronger agents of reform.
## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Principal Shadowing Coding Categories

#### A. Organizational Leadership

1. Managing budgets, resources  
2. Hiring personnel  
3. Managing instructional staff or discussing their concerns  
4. Managing non-instructional staff or discussing their concerns  
5. Designing/managing the school master schedule  
6. Planning/holding school staff meetings  
7. Participating in required district office meetings  
8. Interacting/networking with other principals  
9. Engaging in self-improvement/professional development  
10. Setting school policies (non-instructional)

#### B. Day-to-Day Operations

11. Maintaining campus facilities  
12. Developing and monitoring a safe school environment  
13. Managing student discipline  
14. Managing student services (records, reporting, activities)  
15. Managing student attendance-related activities  
16. Managing/providing student social & emotional supports  
17. Preparing, implementing, and administering standardized tests  
18. Supervising students as a scheduled daily activity  
19. Managing personal or school schedule  
20. Finding and managing substitutes; coordinating around teacher absences  
21. Fulfilling compliance requirements (not including Special Ed)

#### C. Instructional Program Development

22. Developing an educational program across the school  
23. Reviewing and selecting curriculum, materials or textbooks  
24. Using assessment results for program evaluation & development  
25. Planning PD for teachers for the year/semester  
26. Planning supplementary, after-school or summer school instruction

#### D. Day-to-Day Instruction

27. Planning or conducting informal classroom observations / walk-throughs  
28. Informally coaching teachers to improve instruction or their teaching in general  
29. Formally evaluating teachers and providing instructional feedback to support their improvement  
30. Planning or facilitating PD for teachers  
31. Implementing PD required by the district office  
32. Using data to inform instruction  
33. Fulfilling Special Education requirements  
34. Teaching students  
35. Directing supplementary, after-school or summer school instruction

#### E. Fostering Internal Relationships

36. Developing relationships with students  
37. Communicating with parents  
38. Interacting socially with staff about non-school related topic  
39. Interacting socially with staff about school-related topic (shop talk)  
40. Attending school activities  
41. Counseling or in-depth conversation with students

#### F. Fostering External Relationships

42. Working with local community members or organizations  
43. Fundraising  
44. Recruiting school volunteers from the community  
45. Publicizing school events and achievements  
46. Recruiting students to attend school  
47. Managing the school’s image in local media (e.g., newspapers)  
48. Talking about how to increase parent involvement

#### G. Additional Tasks

49. In transition between activities, personal time  
50. Email, fax, call or paperwork when uncertain of what or who with  
51. Other

Appendix B: Coding Detail

### A. Organizational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Managing budgets, resources</th>
<th>• Processing purchasing paperwork • Checking what’s left in this year's budget • Planning next year’s budget • Asking staff what resources they need • Discussing budget with staff • Discussing how many teachers need to hire next year • Talking about movement of teachers to reduce budget • Discussing contracts for campus vending machines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Hiring personnel</td>
<td>• Talking to/interviewing prospective teacher • Talking to another principal about transferring teacher into school • Making hiring decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Managing instructional staff or discussing their concerns</td>
<td>• Talking to teacher about where going to be transferred • Talking to teacher about loss of funding for a program • Talking to a teacher about which classes they will teach next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Managing non-instructional staff or discussing their concerns</td>
<td>• Talking to front office staff (e.g., secretary, administrative assistant), school psychologist, custodial staff about their position/work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Designing/managing the school master schedule</td>
<td>• Discussion/meeting about school master calendar • Developing calendar to determine teaching schedules/prep periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Planning/holding school staff meetings</td>
<td>[Note: These are scheduled/planned meetings, generally with a formal agenda with multiple items to discuss. i.e., If it is a couple teachers meeting with the principal to discuss a problem, use #3 instead.] • Scheduled meetings with staff, grade level teams, school site council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Participating in required district meetings</td>
<td>[Note: These are meetings initiated by the district office which the principal is &quot;required&quot; to attend - they can be formal or informal.] • Attending district office meeting • Taking call from district office • Meeting with district representative about building compliance and changes to school facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Interacting/networking with other principals | • Asking another principal for advice  
• Helping another principal use a computer program or understand online budget allocation information posted by the district  
• Collaborating with another principal on a project |
|---|---|---|
| 9 | Engaging in self-improvement/professional development | • Reading professional development book  
• Attending a district training or PLC meeting |
| 10 | Setting school policies (non-instructional) | • Working on any other non-instructional school policies not covered above |
| B. Day-to-Day Operations |   |   |
| 11 | Maintaining campus facilities | • Cleaning up broken glass or getting someone else to  
• Cleaning own office  
• Fire alarm drill  
• Getting the school painted  
• Making sure buildings are functioning properly (heating, air, doors, windows, etc.)  
• Talking to IT |
| 12 | Developing and monitoring a safe school environment | • Walking around campus and patrolling/monitoring students  
(Note: This is not a #18 because the principal doesn't "have to" be watching students at this time the way s/he would for lunch/recess duty.)  
• Telling student not to run in hallway  
[Note: This is not a #13 because disciplinary action is not being actively taken.]  
• Locker checks  
• Reviewing campus security videos  
• Meeting about how to prevent weapons or drugs on campus  
• Making announcement about school uniform requirements  
• Checking with school security guard(s) about student behavior issues |
| 13 | Managing student discipline | • Calling parent about student discipline incident  
• Disciplining a student for failing to wear uniform properly  
[Note: This is different than making a general announcement about school uniform requirements (#12) because the student is being disciplined for not complying.]  
• Talking with student(s) or teacher(s) involved in discipline incident  
• Administering consequence for inappropriate student behavior  
• Verbally or physically intervening in a conflict  
• Administering a consequence |
| 14 | Managing student services (records, reporting, activities) | • Planning graduation, sports, student council, student club, events  
• Making general announcements on PA (for example, announcing dismissal, hot lunch day, etc.)  
• Organizing bus transportation for field trip  
• Talking to teachers about rewards for student being on honor roll  
• Enrolling a new student  
• Managing a student health emergency |
| 15 | Managing student attendance-related activities | • Reviewing monthly student attendance reports/individual student's attendance record  
• Overseeing and congratulating students at a party for their attendance during school testing days |
| 16 | Managing/providing student social & emotional supports | • Sending a student to talk to a counselor or social worker  
• Listening to student talk about home life and how it may be affecting student behavior or performance at school  
• Providing options/assistance in dealing with conflicts  
• Discussing poor performance or lack of motivation with a student |
| 17 | Preparing, implementing, and administering standardized tests | • Looking for room for standardized testing administration  
• Watching others process tests |
| 18 | Supervising students as a scheduled daily activity | • Lunch/recess duty  
• Monitoring student drop-off/pick-up (Note: Use this code if it seems like the principal does this every day and is officially overseeing the drop-off/pick-up process. If the principal is casually watching the way s/he would be patrolling the hallways at other times of the day, use #12. If s/he is socializing with students, use #36.) |
| 19 | Managing personal or school schedule | • Adding or cancelling appointment/meeting on online or paper calendar  
• Directing office staff to add event to principal's calendar  
• Deciding/announcing whether recess should be outdoors |
| 20 | Finding and managing substitutes; coordinating around teacher absences | • Arranging for a substitute teacher  
• Talking to teachers about splitting up an absent teacher's students across other classrooms |
| 21 | Fulfilling compliance requirements (not including Special Ed) | • Filling out payroll or timesheet paperwork  
• Signing things (e.g., forms, receipts, paychecks, reimbursement requests)  
[Note: If principal is fulfilling Special Ed compliance, use #33] |
### C. Instructional Program Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22   | Developing an educational program across the school (other than #23-26)             | • Discussing or planning which teachers should teach which subject next year  
|      |                                                                                     | • Planning improvements                                                  |
|      |                                                                                     | • Discussing starting a new reading initiative                           |
| 23   | Reviewing/selecting curriculum, materials or textbooks                               | • Talking to teachers about merits/critiques of curriculum they are using |
| 24   | Using assessment results for program evaluation & development                        | [Note: Use this code rather than #32 if data is being used specifically to evaluate a program or curriculum.] |
| 25   | Planning the year/semester PD program for teachers                                  | • Deciding what the main areas of PD focus should be for the year • Planning general content for PD time (what will be covered when and by whom) • Arranging for an external provider |
| 26   | Planning supplementary, after-school or summer school instruction                   | • Discussing budget for after-school program. [Note: Budgeting (#1) can be the secondary code, but the after-school program planning should be the primary code.] |

### D. Day-to-Day Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 27   | Planning or conducting informal classroom observations / walkthrough                | • Checking on teachers and students briefly - no formal evaluation paperwork is completed  
|      |                                                                                     | • Looking at class schedule to find out what time to stop by             |
| 28   | Informally coaching teachers to improve instruction or their teaching in general    | • Writing note to teacher about something observed  
|      |                                                                                     | • Talking to teacher in hallway about materials can use  
<p>|      |                                                                                     | • Talking with teachers about how to meet the needs of a specific student [Note: These needs can be academic as well as social/emotional. i.e., Interpret &quot;teaching&quot; in the broad sense of developing students.] |
| 29   | Formally evaluating teachers and providing instructional feedback to support their improvement | • Extended classroom observation (formal evaluation paperwork completed, looking at student work, classroom materials, etc.) |
| 30   | Planning or facilitating PD for teachers                                            | • Leading a team meeting or PD session • talking to an instructional coach about an upcoming planning meeting • preparing a specific PD session • observing a PD session • participating in a PD session • |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implementing PD required by the district office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 31 | [Note: This is for PD that is planned by the district office.]  
|    | • Scheduling PD for teachers  
|    | • Attending/overseeing PD for teachers  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Using data to inform instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 32 | [Note: Use this code even if principals are just looking at data at this time - i.e., give them benefit of the doubt that they will actually use the info to inform instruction or the education program later.]  
|    | • Reviewing student achievement data  
|    | • Discussing student data with teachers (formally or informally)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fulfiling Special Education requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 33 | • Attending IEP (individual education plan) meeting  
|    | • Filling out any paperwork related to Special Ed  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 34 | • Tutoring  
|    | • Teaching after-school class  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directing supplementary, after-school or summer school instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### E. Fostering Internal Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developing relationships with students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36 | • Saying hi to students in hallway  
|    | • Administering meds to student  
|    | • Greeting students over PA (ex. reading a motivational quote)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communicating with parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 37 | • Taking with parent about organizing activity for school  
|    | • Chatting socially in hall  
|    | • Creating notices to send home to parents about school updates/activities  
|    | • Parent conference  
|    | • Talking with parents about home life or securing social services for family  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interacting socially with staff about non-school related topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 | • Talking with teacher on playground about weekend plans  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interacting socially with staff about school-related topic (shop talk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 39 | • Talking to teacher on playground about a student  
|    | • Talking with staff about school programs, their classrooms, etc. in any informal setting (hallway, playground, cafeteria)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attending school activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 40 | Attending:  
|    | • Sports events  
|    | • Plays  
|    | • Celebrations  
|    | • Assemblies  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Counseling or in-depth conversation with students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### F. Fostering External Relationships
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Working with local community members or organizations</td>
<td>• Working with local businesses to ensure that students are not entering their stores during school hours as they are not allowed off campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>• Grant writing • Bake sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Recruiting school volunteers from the community</td>
<td>• Talking with Lions club representative about getting volunteer tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Publicizing school events and achievements</td>
<td>• Creating flyers for school event • Calling newspaper about school event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Recruiting students to attend school</td>
<td>• Holding open house to encourage new students to attend • Meeting with a prospective student • Going to the school a grade below to talk about attending the principal’s school (e.g. going to a middle school to talk about high school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Managing the school’s image in local media (e.g., newspapers)</td>
<td>• Being interviewed by reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Talking about how to increase parent involvement</td>
<td>• Discussing with a teacher making parents sign off on homework. • How get parents involved in chaperoning school trips, school carnivals, dances, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Additional Tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>In transition between activities, personal time</td>
<td>• Bathroom • Lunch • Personal call • Just walking in hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Email, fax, call or paperwork when uncertain of who with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These categories are adapted from Horng et al, 2009.
Appendix C: Principal Shadowing Interview Form

Principal Time Use Study – Shadowing Interview Form

General Information

1. School name:
2. School level (ES, MS, HS, K-8):
3. Principal name:
4. Years of experience as a principal:
5. Principal gender (M/F):

Morning Check-in (before the shadowing day begins)
Remind the principal of your role (to be as invisible as possible), and see if s/he has any questions.

1. Let’s go over the day so I know a little about what to expect, and so we can talk about if there’s anything that I shouldn’t shadow. What’s your plan for the day? (Get the specifics, so that as you are shadowing you’ll be able to check off whether the activity is planned or not.)

   *If there is anything you aren’t shadowing, please briefly note what and why. Be sure to capture this time in the tracking form even though you’re not observing.*

2. Did you do any work this morning at home before getting here? If so, what and for how long? *(Record here so that you can add this time to the tracking sheet.)*

3. Anything I should know before we start?

At the conclusion of the shadowing day, please ask the principal the following questions:

1. How typical would you say this day was, in terms of how you generally spend your time?
   1 = Very typical
   2 = Pretty typical
   3 = Sort of atypical
   4 = Very atypical
2. What if any elements were atypical? What things do you typically spend more/less time doing?

3. Do you feel like you're using your time the way you want to be? *(Prompt for in what ways...)*

4. If not, what would you say are the three top things that get in the way of your using the time the way you want to?

5. Now I’d like to switch gears and ask briefly about the staff in the building.

   a. # of assistant principals: ____
      - For each: how many years experience as an assistant principal? ___
      - For each: how would you rate this person’s capacity as an assistant principal on a scale from 1-5, with 1 being “not competent” to 5 being “exceptional”? ___

   b. # of instructional coaches/facilitators/instructional leaders: ____
      - For each: how would you rate this person’s capacity as a *(fill in role)* on a scale from 1-5, with 1 being “not competent” to 5 being “exceptional”? ___

   c. # of school secretaries/clerks/office admin: ____
   d. # of teachers: ____
   e. Total # of staff in the building (if known; ballpark is fine): ____

6. How would you describe the role of your assistant principal(s)? How do they typically spend their time? *(Prompt for what percent of time they spend on instruction-related activities, discipline, administration, etc)*.

7. How would you describe the role(s) of your instructional lead staff (if any)?

8. Thank you for your time, we really appreciate it. Two more things:
   - Is it ok if I email or call you tomorrow to follow up to see what if any work you do tonight after leaving here? Is a call or an email easier for you?
   - And also, we may be contacting some principals for follow-up interviews, would you be open to that if so?
Appendix D: The Design of the Principal Time Use Study

Data for the study came from three sources: principal shadowing, focus groups, and central office staff interviews.

Principal shadowing: To gather information on a principal’s typical day, DPS Ritchie fellows shadowed a total of 22 principals, selected to represent a range of school levels, sizes, Title I status, and principal experience. After a short training session, the fellows used a rubric adapted from Horng et al (2009), (see Appendix A & B) to record and code the principals’ time use in five-minute increments. ERS validated the coding after the data was collected. The shadowing began when the principal arrived at the school and ended when the principal left the school at the end of the day. The Ritchie fellows captured any additional work hours after the principal left the building by a follow-up phone interview the next day. The researchers finished the shadow day with a brief scripted interview (Appendix C), asking the principal how typical the day had been as well as some general questions about time use and administrative staffing levels at the school, in order to provide context.

Principal focus groups: The purpose of the focus groups was to gather principal perspectives on 1) what central office requirements take principals the most time; and 2) how district demands on their time could be streamlined, reduced or improved. We held four focus groups in March 2011, with a total of 22 principals. Groups were organized by school level (large elementary schools, small elementary schools, K-8 and middle schools, and high schools), and ranged in size from three to eight participants. A notice about the study was sent to all principals in the district and they were invited to attend the focus groups; we accepted all of those who volunteered to participate. Focus group sessions were each 90 minutes in length, and participants were told that information from the sessions would be aggregated and shared with the central office but that nothing said at the sessions would be attributed to individuals. The focus groups were organized around two key questions:

- Are there activities the central office asks of you that are important – high value – but could be done in a way that involved less time and effort on your part? (i.e. better process)
- Are there activities the central office asks of you that take up a lot of your time but you perceive as low value (i.e., you don’t understand why you’re performing them, or they get in the way of your being effective?)

Central office staff interviews: We interviewed three Instructional Superintendents (two elementary and one secondary) and held a group interview with seven HR school business partners. Each interview lasted about 60 minutes and was held the same week as the principal focus group sessions. The purpose of these interviews was to discuss the initial findings from the focus groups, and understand the central office staff perspectives on principals’ time burdens.

Disclaimer: The findings discussed here are reported impressions from a small sample of Central office staff and principals. The shadowed principals (15%) were selected non-randomly and followed on a single day in late March near state testing dates. We do not know how universal the identified issues are or which types of schools are most affected. In addition, we understand that some of the issues raised are unique to this year and/or are already being addressed. Although we must interpret the shadow data cautiously, it can give us a snapshot of how typical DPS principals use their time on a given day. The overall study can serve as an important foundation for rethinking principal roles and responsibilities going forward.
Appendix E: Tables and Charts

Table 1: DPS Principal Shadowing Time Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Office</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Grounds</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Office</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallways</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Room</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Estimated Time per School Required for LEAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District School name</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th># of APs</th>
<th>Teacher to P/AP Ratio</th>
<th>Observations as % of School Year</th>
<th>Minutes per Day</th>
<th>Current Formal Evaluation (Code 29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln High School</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnett Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Court Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromwell Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC Middle College</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College View Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Center For International</td>
<td>Secondary (6-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldrich Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee K-8 School</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Archuleta Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Middle School</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt-Waller K-8 School</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinner Middle School</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiley Middle School</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Renaissance School Of The Arts</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South High School</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valverde Elementary School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages

- 40 Observation Minutes per day
- 8% of school year
- Current Average of 16.8 minutes (11.3 typical day) based on data to right
Table 3: Principal’s District Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting List Generated by Principals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Monthly 1-1 IS meetings (2-4 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monthly network meeting (full day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quarterly regional meetings (2 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instructional Rounds meetings (varies, intent is quarterly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedagogical Content Knowledge Intensives (PCK) meetings (3 anchor events so far during school year, plus summer time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher Leader Academy (TLA) meetings (quarterly plus some summer time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ELA Cohort meetings (originally monthly, but paused part way through the year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UIP meetings (2-3 half days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On-track-to-graduation (multiple mandatory meetings looking at the same report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AP Leadership meetings (on AP courses in high schools; timing reported as random)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Red School partner meetings (formerly weekly, but now reduced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monthly community meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>