



MEASURING AND BUILDING INTERMEDIARY CAPACITY

Supporting Equity-Focused Networked Improvement In Schools

Catalyst:Ed
March 2021

About Catalyst:Ed

Catalyst:Ed is a national nonprofit that catalyzes equity, innovation, and improvement in education by connecting leaders to critical resources. In the process, we are democratizing access to expertise and opportunity, amplifying the impact of the sector's brightest talent, and redefining how organizations learn and build capacity.

Key elements of our work include:

Activate: We activate diverse networks of expert talent, rich with deep knowledge, skills and experiences.

Connect: We advise and connect education leaders with the right resources and supports, mobilizing intentional teams that come together for high-impact initiatives.

Catalyze: We catalyze ecosystems of expert support in high-need, high-impact areas.

Inform: We capture and disseminate insights to build sector knowledge and capacity.

Website: www.catalyst-ed.org | Email: info@catalyst-ed.org



Contents

I. Introduction

II. Looking Under the Hood

- Theoretical underpinnings

- The methodology

- Key design decisions

III. Defining Capacities: Understanding the ICAF

- Continuous Improvement.

- Network Initiation, Management & Support

- Measurement & Data for Improvement

- Inclusive Culture

- Leadership Support

- Look Fors

IV. Using the ICAF to Assess and Build Capacity

- Key design decisions

- Building Capacity

V. Conclusion

Appendix A - Acknowledgments

Appendix B - Full Intermediary Capacity Framework (ICAF): Capacities, Definitions, and Look-Fors.

Appendix C: ICAF Research Notes



Executive Summary

Across the country, teams of school leaders are leveraging continuous improvement practices to dramatically improve outcomes for Black, Latinx, and low-income students. Many schools are learning about and adopting these practices as part of a network led by an intermediary that serves as the facilitator, project manager, and knowledge manager for the community. Given the complex issues encountered in education, a well-run network creates the opportunity for a diverse set of stakeholders to identify an important problem of practice, collaboratively identify innovative solutions, generate and reflect on rapid learnings, and update teaching and learning practices accordingly.

Since 2018, Catalyst:Ed has been supporting Networks for School Improvement (NSIs) - improvement networks funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation - to strengthen their capacity to facilitate critical improvement work in hundreds of schools, districts, and networks across the nation. Early in this initiative, Catalyst:Ed recognized the need for a practical, action-oriented framework and self-assessment tool to help intermediaries better understand the capacities that are necessary to successfully lead an improvement network, as well as to assess their own strengths and areas for growth. We also saw an opportunity to place equity at the center of the work: we know from experience that intermediaries who waver in their commitment to equity can reproduce the inequality embedded within the schools they are trying to serve, yet many existing frameworks related to networks and continuous improvement have lacked an explicit or consistent equity focus. Finally, we saw an opportunity to engage with a diverse set of voices and incorporate their collective wisdom into this framework and self-assessment tool. The result is the [Intermediary Capacity Framework](#).

This paper outlines the theoretical underpinnings of the framework and its roots in the extensive work published by the Carnegie Foundation and their Fellows, the methodology we used to create the framework including soliciting input from over 60 researchers, practitioners, and technical assistance providers, and some key design decisions we made such as how to ensure equity was at the center of the framework, and keeping a focus on intermediaries rather than networks as a whole. Finally, we discuss our development and use of self-assessment tools to help intermediary leaders identify their areas for growth and take action to grow their capacity to lead strong networks of school improvement.



I. Introduction

Across the country, teams of school leaders are leveraging continuous improvement practices to dramatically improve outcomes for Black, Latinx, and low-income students. Many schools are learning about and adopting these practices as part of an improvement network or Networked Improvement Community (NIC)¹ led by an intermediary that serves as the facilitator, project manager, and knowledge manager for the community. Given the complex issues encountered in education, a well-run network creates the opportunity for a diverse set of stakeholders to identify an important problem of practice, collaboratively identify innovative solutions, generate and reflect on rapid learnings, and update teaching and learning practices accordingly. Additionally, improvement networks are well-organized to surface and codify key learnings, allowing for the efficient transfer of information and practice across their members.²

Since 2018, Catalyst:Ed has been supporting Networks for School Improvement (NSIs) - improvement networks funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation - to strengthen their capacity to facilitate critical improvement work in hundreds of schools, districts, and networks across the nation. Early in this initiative, Catalyst:Ed recognized the need for a practical, action-oriented framework and self-assessment tool to help intermediaries better understand the capacities that are necessary to successfully lead an improvement network, as well as to assess their own strengths and areas for growth. We also saw an opportunity to place equity at the center of the work: we know from experience that intermediaries who waver in their commitment to equity can reproduce the inequality embedded within the schools they are trying to serve, yet many existing frameworks related to networks and continuous improvement have lacked an explicit or consistent equity focus. Finally, we saw an opportunity to engage with a diverse set of voices and incorporate their collective wisdom into this framework and self-assessment tool.

Through an iterative development process, Catalyst:Ed consulted the existing research base, engaged with a wide range of stakeholders, and connected directly with intermediaries to understand the necessary skills to run a Network for School Improvement (NSI). Early versions of the tool were piloted with the NSI community and then improved before being tested again with NSIs and non-NSI intermediaries. The resultant [Intermediary Capacity Framework \(ICAF\)](#) is rooted in improvement science theory while also being a practitioner-oriented and adaptive tool.

The purpose of this document is to familiarize leaders who are either part of an improvement network or interested in starting and/or leading an improvement network with the ICAF. We begin by outlining the research base and the methodology through which we developed the ICAF, as well as key design decisions. We then provide a brief overview of the ICAF and the process by which it is administered. Finally, we share how NSIs have leveraged the ICAF to prioritize capacity-building and outline some of our lessons learned.

¹ [Bryk A. S., Gomez L. M., Grunow A. \(2010\). Getting Ideas Into Action: Building Networked Improvement Communities in Education, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Stanford, CA, essay.](#)

² [Huang, M. \(2018\). 2016-2017 Impact Report: Six years of results from the Carnegie Math Pathways, San Francisco, CA: WestEd.](#)



II. Looking Under the Hood: Theoretical Underpinnings, Key Design Decisions, and Methodology

Theoretical underpinnings

Over the last two decades, several studies have illustrated the power that high functioning improvement networks can have for increasing student achievement in schools. Many of these improvement networks are informed by and rest on the extensive literature base of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Jennifer Lin Russell and her colleagues summarize the functionality of NICs, saying: "NICs enable practitioners, researchers, and designers to work together to specify an important problem of practice, develop, test, and refine innovative tools and practices to address the problem, spread and support the uptake of practical knowledge, and analyze data to monitor progress toward a network-wide improvement goal".³

Key to the success of a NIC is the involvement of a well-established intermediary -- often referred to as a hub -- to serve as the functional leader of this work. Intermediaries use their central position to connect both individuals and systems, fueling them with opportunities to adapt and change in the face of complex educational problems.⁴ The Carnegie Foundation identified five major tasks for a successful intermediary:

1. build capacity;
2. orchestrate professional learning;
3. create a strong network community;
4. engage in site-level improvement routines; and
5. measure the network.⁵

Jointly, these five major activities position the hub as a generator of opportunities for connection, which, in turn, develops social capital among participating schools and organizations. This trust - and systems and processes implemented by the hub for knowledge codification and sharing - allow for the increased likelihood that participants would be likely to deploy new practices quickly. We leaned heavily on these capacities in the development of our framework not only because of the solid research base but because they were often noted by practitioners as important keys to success. Practitioners also identified two other key areas that we added to the ICAF and will discuss more in a later section: Inclusive Culture and Leadership Support.

The methodology

The ICAF was developed through a multi-stage, iterative process of surfacing and aggregating the collective expertise of the sector, including leaders who are currently involved in the facilitation of school improvement networks or NICs, researchers who study improvement networks in education, and summary reports, strategies, and action plans of foundations, consultants, and school leaders.

³ [Russell, J. L., Bryk, A. S., Dolle, J., Gomez, L. M., LeMahieu, P., & Grunow, A. \(2017\). A framework for the initiation of networked improvement communities. *Teachers College Record*, 119\(7\), 1-36.](#)

⁴ [Honig, M. I. \(2004\). The new middle management: Intermediary organizations in education policy implementation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26\(1\), 65-87.](#)

⁵ [Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., & Grunow, A. \(2011\). Getting ideas into action: Building networked improvement communities in education. In *Frontiers in Sociology of Education* \(pp. 127-162\). Springer, Dordrecht, Germany.](#)



We sought out this broad group of stakeholders to ensure multiple perspectives were considered. These stakeholders were asked to weigh in on questions such as:

- Based on your research and experience, what skills are necessary to successfully lead an improvement network? How would you describe each of those skills?
- What does “good” look like, and how do you know if you’re on track to get there?
- How do capacities interact and/or overlap with each other?
- What does it look like to do this work with equity truly at the forefront?

We drafted a framework and tool in November 2018 that we then used with 21 NSIs, a process that generated an immense amount of feedback. We reflected on that feedback then held a working session to step back and consider our design decisions that led to the development of an updated version of the framework in Summer 2019. We then spent that fall iterating on that draft with the input of dozens of experts and field leaders. After a deep-dive on Knowledge Management with NSI leaders and staff from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation in early 2021, and another round of self-assessments with NSIs, we made a third major revision to arrive at the current version.

Key design decisions

Our focus on capacity building and our commitment to equity led us to four critical design decisions early on: First, we would focus on capacities rather than attributes, activities, and outcomes. Second, we would focus on intermediaries rather than the network as a whole. Third, we would embed equity throughout the framework. And fourth, we would focus on data for improvement rather than assessment. We elaborate on each of these below:

- **Focus on capacities** Our extensive review of the literature and conversations with diverse stakeholders revealed that the majority of research and tools available to practitioners focus on a mixture of attributes, activities, and outcomes without specific considerations around what skills and abilities are needed to conduct those activities and achieve those outcomes. In order to serve as a tool that is practically-relevant and action-oriented, we felt the need to be more specific about the skills and abilities necessary for success, and how those skills and abilities interact with attributes, activities, and outcomes. We believe that **capacities are a set of skills, abilities, actions, attributes, resources, and beliefs that consistently lead to a desired set of outcomes.** As it is difficult in practical settings to assess a person or organization’s skill or ability separate from looking at their activities, actions, or outcomes, our capacities are often described using the language of activities or attributes in order to be as descriptive as possible, and so the framework communicates to users the specific actions they can take and ways of working that will help them achieve outcomes toward their goals. Table 1 below shares a few examples of this principle at work.



Table 1: Translating Actions, Outcomes, and Attributes to Capacities, Examples

Capacity	Action, attribute, or outcome visible in practice	Skill or ability
Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	Having a clear and well-defined network aim.	The ability to successfully lead teams through a process of developing and committing to a target of improved outcomes for defined student groups.
Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	The intermediary is knowledgeable about best practices for adult learning and applies them to achieve a set of outcomes with groups of adults.	The ability to design and execute inclusive and engaging in-person or virtual gatherings of network members focused on accelerating participants' knowledge, skills, learning, and connection.
Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	A team of former school leaders who care about building a strong school culture for staff and students.	The ability to support school leaders so they exhibit consistent, supportive, and inclusive leadership in schools to build a healthy culture for staff and students.

- Focus on intermediaries:** A lot has been written about the role of the network in deepening the quality, sustainability, and outcomes of continuous improvement work, especially in education. However, given our focus on capacity-building and the role of the intermediary as the “engine” of the improvement network, we decided to focus the framework squarely and explicitly on the intermediary. The team of people who work at the intermediary has the most influence over the choices, actions, and success of the network. They ultimately determine and facilitate the processes that are used to define and build consensus around an aim, and use that aim to generate excitement among potential network members through the onboarding process, which they also define and implement. The intermediary sets up the data system that helps network members see their progress and engage in relevant and practical analytic work. And the intermediary continually orients the school teams and their work towards equity, constantly building the skills and habits to tackle difficult issues such as power, privilege, and race in schools and communities. Ultimately, from their central position, intermediaries can uniquely define, measure, and build a holistic suite of the capacities required to advance the work towards their network’s stated goals.

Our decision to focus on intermediary capacity rather than network capacity showed up in our efforts to clearly define the ways that the intermediary creates an experience for participants in the network. For example, we chose not to include specific capacity around instructional practice or teaching and learning, because although fundamental to many improvement efforts, it is not a necessary skill for the intermediary team to possess. Specific content-oriented training can be

obtained by leveraging the skills resident in the community or partnering with experts. At one point, we included a capacity focused on partnerships, including the ability to know when to bring in a partner, find strong partners, and manage those partnerships. At the time of this paper, we removed that capacity and ensured relevant look-fors were included in other capacities. We did so in order to keep the framework as tight as possible, though we do believe the capacity is important to the network's success as it is something that will need to happen many times throughout the life of an improvement network.

Similarly, we have gone back and forth on whether or not to include the capacities of Student Agency and Family & Community Engagement in the core framework. We believe - and our network leaders have told us - that these capacities are of critical importance to creating an inclusive culture and equity-oriented approach. Elements of them are woven into Continuous Improvement and Analytics, Measurement, and Evaluation, but because of the salience of these capacities to many of the intermediaries that we work with, and our own deep-seated belief in their importance, we included specific definitions and additional look-fors so that intermediaries can leverage the wisdom of experts and practitioners to build a vision for what high capacity may look like in these areas.

- **Focus on equity:** Centering equity throughout the framework was not just a critical priority for us - it was also a priority for the NSIs with whom we worked in close partnership and community. For us, equity means:
 - Encouraging and valuing the lived experience of the people we are most trying to serve through our improvement efforts - the students and families in the schools that we partner with.
 - Recognizing the power dynamics at play in all of the systems and structures that surround education in the United States and the lives of the students and families we are serving, and working at every turn to uproot those traditional power dynamics to elevate the ideas, voices, and influence of historically marginalized people.
 - Regularly checking, questioning, and learning whether our thoughts and actions are rooted in bias or causing harm, and helping our partners do the same.

Thus, while the "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" capacity focuses specifically on organizational and team dynamics around racial and gender equity, the ICAF goes further and explicitly outlines specific equity considerations for most capacities. We illustrate this with an example in Table 2.



Table 2: Equity Considerations in ICAF Capacities

Original Capacity	Updated Capacity
<p>CI Process - Aim Identification: Demonstrated experience with CI processes, or deep experience using quantitative and qualitative data to set goals and drive improvement.</p>	<p>Build Commitment to a Clear and Specific Aim: Definition: Ability to successfully lead teams through a process of developing and committing to a measurable, time-bound, culturally-responsive, and asset-based target of improved outcomes for defined student groups.</p> <p>Look Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We leverage our understanding of the system and analysis of baseline data to develop targets for our defined student groups. • Our network aim is reasonable, clearly defined, and compelling. • We use an inclusive process for surfacing and compiling the assets of our target population and local communities to inform the development of the aim. • We have one or more vetted protocols for co-creating the network aim with school teams. • Our aim-identification process builds will among network participants. • We revisit and update the aim as we learn together and/or conditions change. • Our target-setting work has led to small or large positive changes on student indicators or outcomes.

Some of the specific changes to foreground diversity, equity, and inclusion include:

- The name changed from a passive action to one that clearly articulates the need for team-wide engagement and buy-in.
 - Additional recognition of the importance and value of people's lived experience, as well as the explicit need for the hub to support the collaboration with the ultimate beneficiaries of the improvement (students and families), further explain how this capacity would play out if equity were at the forefront of the work.
 - Recognition that this work requires iteration in order to ensure opportunities for inclusion and to adapt as our systems, knowledge, and understanding begin to shift.
- **Focus on data for improvement:**
 The use of data in the continuous improvement process is fundamentally different than the habits and practices ingrained in American schools today.⁶ Data for improvement requires improvement team members to be creative and develop or identify a small set of data points to show evidence of slight differences resulting from small changes in their own practice. While they may be able to leverage district-level assessment systems in some cases, those data points are often lagging the

⁶ Yeager, D., Bryk, A. S., Muhich, J., Hausman, H., & Morales, L. (2013). Practical measurement. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Stanford, CA.



improvement cycle or are too high-level. For example, a teacher team working to improve student outcomes in math may focus on student talk as their unit of change. Their practical measurements may include exit tickets or collection and analysis of the language students use to explain a solution to another student. Over time, the improvement team may connect what they believe to be improvements in discourse to student scores on quizzes or tests, ie: traditional formative assessments. These teams need help to ensure that their practical measures are aligned with those formative assessments and can affect the overarching aim of the network over time.

Because of the shift in how data is used for improvement vs. traditional accountability, hubs and school teams may need to build capacity to make sure that new measures are valid for the purpose they are being used. Additionally, they may need to make significant structural changes to their data infrastructure to make it work for the relatively fast pace of testing, for integrating various data sources so various users can see patterns, to note bright spots, and to elevate concerns. These platforms need to make it easy for all of the various members of hub and improvement teams to access and use the data platform given that improvement work necessitates horizontal and vertical use of common data. This is simply not how many traditional systems have been set up. As such, an understanding of the nuances of these data applications and data flows, combined with expertise in the power of rigorous continuous improvement processes, are necessary to support improvement networks.

III. Defining Capacities: Understanding the ICAF

The ICAF describes the capacities necessary to run an improvement network successfully. The framework is designed to articulate the capacities that an intermediary must have in order to leverage networked improvement strategies to improve educational outcomes for a specific population of students. The ICAF identifies 17 capacities that are organized into five groups. Each capacity is accompanied by a definition and a set of look-fors:

- Continuous Improvement
- Network Initiation, Management, and Support
- Measurement & Data for Improvement
- Inclusive Culture
- Leadership Support

As noted earlier, the first three capacity groups are well-documented in the research as to their importance in running improvement networks. It was through our discussions with practitioners and prototyping of our tool that we developed a deep appreciation of the increasing importance of Inclusive Culture and Leadership Support, resulting in us adding these two competencies into the framework. As mentioned in the previous section, our framework seeks to embed equity throughout the framework. But beyond that, there are specific elements of the way the intermediary team functions, and the skills necessary to ensure that functioning, that are necessary to create the culture of inclusion, respect, and connection that is needed to have open and honest conversations about power, privilege, and how those show up in the work of the improvement teams. Similarly, all of the experts and practitioners we talked to reflected on the importance of supporting school and central office leaders as a critical component to their success as a Hub. Many, especially Hubs who are not



also the central office team, talked about skills they had to develop in order to better support these leaders, such as leadership coaching skills, tools and systems to improve communication, and helping leaders understand the improvement process and their role in it. We elaborate on these in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Capacities and definitions (for detailed look fors, see [the full framework here](#))

Continuous Improvement.	Understand the System	Ability to use multiple and varied forms of data, structured tools or protocols, and input from those most affected by the system to help improvement teams clearly see the root causes that produce current inequitable outcomes.
	Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	Experience successfully leading teams through a process of developing and committing to a measurable, time-bound, culturally-responsive, and asset-based target of improved outcomes for defined student groups.
	Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	Demonstrated strengths in leveraging research, data, and practical knowledge to build, articulate, and iterate on a shared theory of how to reach the defined aim.
	Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	Ability to help teams identify logical and relevant strategies, implement and use feedback and data to test those strategies, reflect, and take action based on what they learned.
Network Initiation, Management & Support	Network Initiation	Ability to identify, recruit, onboard, and set clear expectations, roles, and responsibilities for network members.
	Network Cohesion	Demonstrated ability to intentionally shape interactions and connections between network members to deepen a community-aligned identity, exchange knowledge through shared learning, and interact regularly around common problems of practice.
	Network Management	Experience developing and following an intentional plan of routines and activities with network members, while responding to data and feedback, to ensure the network maintains momentum and stays on track.
	Network Member Development	Ability to design and execute inclusive and engaging in-person or virtual gatherings of network members focused on accelerating participants' knowledge, skills, learning, and connection.
	Knowledge Management	Experience developing and managing systems (both human and technical) to surface lessons from research and practice, consolidate or adapt where necessary, and make readily available to network members to accelerate learning.



Measurement & Data for Improvement	Data Infrastructure	Ability to reliably and securely collect, connect, manage, and report data from across the network.
	Analytics, Measurement, & Evaluation	Ability to collect, analyze, and report on data to determine where, whether, and how the network is moving toward the aim, as well as to share and celebrate successes.
	Practical Measurement	Experience successfully helping improvement teams identify, collect, analyze, and discuss the data necessary to understand if and how disciplined inquiry cycles are having intended effects for the population they are designed to reach.
Inclusive Culture	Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	Ability to create an environment of involvement, respect, connection, and empowerment among team members from a wide range of identities, perspectives, and experiences so they can work across schools to ensure that student access, participation, and outcomes are not correlated with demographic factors.
	Student Agency	Support school-based teams to create a school culture where students have the ability to direct aspects of their learning and experience, and where student leadership and input are meaningfully integrated into the decision-making fabric of the school.
	Family & Community Engagement	Support school and district leaders to meaningfully include families, and the community in the improvement process by creating frequent, supportive, and inclusive opportunities for dialogue, input, reflection, analysis, and co-creation of action steps.
Leadership Support	School Leadership & Leader Support	Experience supporting school leaders to exhibit consistent, supportive, and inclusive leadership in schools to build a healthy culture for staff and students.
	District Leadership & Leader Support	Experience supporting district leaders to exhibit consistent, strategic, and inclusive leadership across district departments and schools to ensure the work of the NSI remains a top priority.

Look Fors

In building out the framework with experts from our network, we heard many different ways used to describe what “good” looks like. We noticed different people focusing on different aspects or applications of the same idea based on their experiences, challenges, or areas of focus. Because the work is complex and multifaceted, and there is no single path to growth and development that could account for the diversity of strengths and abilities resident in the field, we developed a set of “look-fors” for each capacity to allow this nuance and depth to shine through the framework.

The look-fors are provided to help intermediaries see the different ways that a capacity could play out in their work. Taken together for a specific capacity, the look-fors demonstrate the things that a



sophisticated hub team would know and be able to do. For developing teams, the look-fors should illuminate some concrete areas for growth.

The look-fors are not linear, ie: the first look-for in the list is not always the most critical for success nor the first skill that should be development. We believe that people know their own context the best, and that they need to be invested in - and are the drivers of - their own growth and development. As such, we have designed the look-fors to be a guide for discussion among teams rather than a linear, step-by-step prescription for the order in which a team should work to build their capacity.

IV. Using the ICAF to Assess and Build Capacity

Understanding what capacities are important for intermediaries running networks is important, but how do you measure it? During our development process, we often found ourselves asking questions about whether a particular element of the definition or a look-for was important for early-stage intermediaries or more mature teams. We realized that while the ICAF would serve as the overarching framework, intermediaries would be best served by slightly different measurement tools for different purposes. And since the purpose of measuring capacity for us is to inform capacity-building efforts, reflection and self-assessment would be key.

Key design decisions

- Since we believe that intermediaries know themselves best, but that having a framework and support can help give language to and draw out good thinking, we developed a tool that focuses on reflection and context, not simple numeric ratings.
- We added a series of “look-fors” to give people a benchmark of quality, but our goal is not to arrive at a numeric score. Because of the complexity of what constitutes a capacity, and because it is not an absolute science, it would be imperfect and perhaps misleading at this point to conclusively determine a capacity rating based on these look-fors. Rather, we offer qualitative capacity categories and help individuals choose where to place their teams or their organizations. The language used around the categories sometimes helps people rate themselves honestly.
- We believe that organizations know their context best and should have agency over their capacity-building activities, so we see the capacity assessment results as a roadmap rather than a firm plan. Although we will suggest next steps for capacity-building based on resulting areas of strength or challenge, we will not “prescribe” them.

Our primary Intermediary Capacity Assessment Tool (ICAT) involves a one-hour conversation between Catalyst:Ed and pairs of team members or small groups from each intermediary. Using Trello, an online card-sorting tool, we lead teams through an interactive guided self-assessment of their organizational capacity. While the data that result from the card sorting activity is important, the more important data comes from the real-time reflections and processing that an organization does as they attempt to place themselves on each capacity on the scale below. Catalyst:Ed facilitates the experience by asking for examples to understand an intermediary's abilities and experiences in a capacity area and helping them envision what the next stage of growth might look like. We collect, analyze, and report on these data via a short report for each intermediary, and we periodically roll up



the data across intermediaries to surface trends. Intermediary leaders often tell us that this guided reflection helped them envision their team, organization, or network at a greater level of skill development and provided them a pathway to either build capacity internally or connect with a provider for support.

We are also in the process of developing a standalone, independent capacity assessment tool that will allow intermediaries to reflect on their capacity and receive a tailored roadmap for growth without the involvement of Catalyst:Ed. This tool is expected to be launched in April 2021.

Building Capacity

On the surface, each capacity in the ICAF reads as a tool that one can deploy on an as-needed basis to work through a challenge. The power of networked improvement, however, is in the interrelatedness of the capacities, requiring a deep understanding of all of the capacities and how they fit together. We have observed through our work with intermediaries at various levels of maturity that it is difficult to have this depth of understanding at the beginning of a networked improvement journey. As such, we have seen repeatedly that the partnership of a provider who has walked this walk by incorporating equity in continuous improvement, infusing strong measurement throughout their network initiation and operations, or tightening up data cycles using a plan-do-study-act methodology can be incredibly helpful for intermediaries and improvement teams. Outside providers can help intermediaries identify their blind spots in process, content, or equity. They can develop supportive toolkits to guide the replicability and increase the quality of intermediaries' improvement work. And they can help ensure that measurement systems are effective, human-centered, and culturally-responsive. In short, they can help take intermediaries' skills from good to great and lead to significantly increased outcomes for network teams and the students they serve.

Once intermediaries have assessed their capacities against the ICAF and have a sense of the areas in which they would like to improve, Catalyst:Ed partners closely with them to pinpoint opportunities for growth. We facilitate a process so intermediaries can identify a technical assistance provider from our expert network who can support them with capacity building. Our work so far with NSIs or similar intermediaries running networked improvement communities has led us to hone our support for intermediaries in a couple of key ways: attending to the maturity of the intermediary, and infusing equity throughout our support for intermediaries.

With regards to intermediary maturity, the ICAT data that we collected from NSIs have shown us a few key differences between new and more established intermediaries. We have seen that early-stage intermediaries focus a lot on process, oftentimes choosing a continuous improvement coach to, for example, take their traditional school improvement work with data cycles to a tighter, more iterative cycle that intentionally captures lessons from each cycle and builds on those lessons to get to the next. Other common challenges we saw for newer intermediaries included: communicating about the improvement process in a way that speaks to teachers and school leaders, and ensuring data systems are connected between intermediaries and school teams.

Of the more mature intermediaries that we worked with, many are looking to build capacity in two key areas: 1) practical measurement - ensuring that school teams are identifying and using measures that actually measure their small tests of change but can be rolled-up to longer-term impact, and 2)



knowledge management - creating systems that improvement team members will actually use to capture and share lessons from improvement cycles. While earlier-stage intermediaries were aware of these capacity areas, they certainly are not as essential for launching networked improvement work, but come into greater focus as networks begin to see their flywheel of improvement turning and are able to pay more attention to outputs and outcomes rather than process.

With regards to equity, we have seen that intermediaries are increasingly putting a priority on integrating equity in their processes, systems, and tools. As noted earlier, NSIs have an acute awareness that network improvement for the purposes of closing educational gaps cannot be achieved without equity as a leading driver. They are also realizing that equity journeys are not “open and shut” experiences but rather must be baked into the fabric of organizational improvement. Many of the intermediaries we’ve worked with have been looking for support from consultants with expertise in DEI to review their tools, processes, and language to ensure that it doesn’t perpetuate white-dominant systems and behaviors, and to make corrections when it does. Others have requested coaching support to help them find language to speak directly to school teams about the bias and inequity they see from the vantage point of a hub facilitator, knowing that the position of a hub is delicate when network members ultimately make a personal choice about how deeply to engage with their improvement work. We are also seeing NSIs who want to bring deep historical context about race and place to their “understanding the system” work, and others who want DEI coaching support for staff climate assessments and follow-up facilitation support.

V. Conclusion

As Catalyst:Ed continues to support intermediaries in the critical work of school improvement, we will continue our own ongoing data collection, analysis, reflection, and improvement of this framework and our support services. We will continue to push intermediaries to identify where they are on their equity journeys, and encourage capability-building support for intermediaries working with school teams. If COVID-19 has taught us anything, it is that having the habits and routines of improvement in place - including the ability to easily and regularly collect practical data from a wide range of sources, the ability to use those data to identify, test, and evaluate new practices at all times, and the ability to scale promising practices quickly - is critical for our ongoing efforts to ensure our education system meets the needs of all learners. We look forward to continuing to share our support, lessons, and insights with the field so that organizations taking on the critical work of improvement are doing so in the most high-impact ways so that we can truly see a more equitable future for all students.



Appendix A - Acknowledgments

The ICAF was developed by [Catalyst.Ed](#), leveraging the collective expertise of the sector, with special appreciation for the following people and teams:

- Lead contributor: Ke Wu
- Additional contributors: Shermica Farquhar, Sandra Park, Julie Smith, Andrew Volkert, Juanita Zerda
- NSI Leaders: Jennie Brotman, Jesse Hinueber, Kate Haisten and the Communities Foundation of Texas data team, Erin Hellman, Jeff Jablow, Jen Murtha, Chris Thorn
- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's K12 Place-Based Delivery Team, especially Jennifer Husbands, Brandee Tate, and Adam Goldfarb



Appendix B - Full Intermediary Capacity Framework (ICAF): Capacities, Definitions, and Look-Fors.

Developed by Catalyst:Ed

Updated March 2021

Overview: The Intermediary Capacity Framework (ICAF) is a resource for intermediaries supporting Networks for School Improvement (NSIs), or those considering running NSIs in the future. The framework is designed to articulate the capacities that an intermediary must have in order to successfully leverage networked improvement strategies to improve educational outcomes for a specific population of students.

ICAF Contributors:

The ICAF was developed by [Catalyst:Ed](#), leveraging the collective expertise of the sector, with special appreciation for the following people and teams:

- Lead contributor: Ke Wu
- Additional contributors: Shermica Farquhar, Sandra Park, Julie Smith, Andrew Volkert, Juanita Zerda
- NSI Leaders: Jennie Brotman, Jesse Hinueber, Kate Haisten and the Communities Foundation of Texas data team, Erin Hellman, Jeff Jablow, Jen Murtha, Chris Thorn
- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's K12 Place-Based Delivery Team, especially Jennifer Husbands, Brandee Tate, and Adam Goldfarb

Please see Appendix A for some of the key research that informed this framework. For a thorough articulation of the methodology and design decisions that were made in the development of this framework, we encourage you to review our paper, "Measuring and Building Intermediary Capacity."

We welcome your feedback! Please send us an email with your thoughts anytime:

si-k12@catalyst-ed.org

ICAF Table of Contents

[Capacity Group: Continuous Improvement](#)

[Capacity Group: Network Initiation, Management & Support](#)

[Capacity Group: Measurement & Data for Improvement](#)

[Capacity Group: Inclusive Culture](#)

[Capacity Group: Leadership Support](#)

[Appendix C: Research Notes](#)

Structure: The ICAF consists of capacities, grouped into "capacity groups." Each capacity is accompanied by a definition as well as a list of "look-fors" that describe the practices that are exhibited by intermediaries who are highly capable in that capacity area.

I. Continuous Improvement: Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Understand the System	<p>Definition: Lead teams through a process of developing and committing to a measurable, time-bound, culturally-responsive, and asset-based target of improved outcomes for defined student groups.</p> <p>Look Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> We leverage our understanding of the system and analysis of baseline data to develop targets for our defined student groups. <input type="checkbox"/> Our network aim is reasonable, clearly defined, and compelling. <input type="checkbox"/> We use an inclusive process for surfacing and compiling the assets of our target population and local communities to inform the development of the aim. <input type="checkbox"/> We have one or more vetted protocols for co-creating the network aim with school teams. <input type="checkbox"/> Our aim-identification process builds will among network participants. <input type="checkbox"/> We have a routine for revisiting and updating the aim as we learn together and/or conditions change. <input type="checkbox"/> Our target-setting work has led to positive changes on student indicators or outcomes within our stated timeframe.
Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	
Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	



Capacity Group: Continuous Improvement

These are the capacities specific to the continuous improvement process. These definitions were heavily inspired by the Continuous Improvement Core Parameters doc created by the NSI Community of Practice.

I. Continuous Improvement: Understand the System	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Understand the System	<p>Definition: Ability to use multiple and varied forms of data, structured tools or protocols, and input from those most affected by the system to help improvement teams clearly see the root causes that produce current inequitable outcomes.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We choose from a variety of protocols (e.g., root cause analysis, empathy interviews) to “see the system” depending on our need at the time. • All of our protocols explicitly center equity in order to meet the needs of the students we serve. • We bring a wide range of qualitative evidence and quantitative data to the process, incorporating various vantage points and perspectives as well as historical and local contexts. • We help teams identify the various disparate outcomes produced by the system during their investigations. • We continuously interrogate our processes to ensure teams see the system from the viewpoint of those most affected by it, and understand the lived experiences of our defined students groups in a way that is culturally-responsive and asset-based. • We routinely revisit and adjust to information about the needs and contexts of our schools, as well as who needs to be involved in understanding the system. • Our system-understanding work has resulted in useful insights for the teams with whom we’re working.
Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	
Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	



I. Continuous Improvement: Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Understand the System	<p>Definition: Ability to successfully lead teams through a process of developing and committing to a measurable, time-bound, culturally-responsive, and asset-based target of improved outcomes for defined student groups.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We leverage our understanding of the system and analysis of baseline data to develop targets for our defined student groups. • Our network aim is reasonable, clearly defined, and compelling. • We use an inclusive process for surfacing and compiling the assets of our target population and local communities to inform the development of the aim. • We have one or more vetted protocols for co-creating the network aim with school teams. • Our aim-identification process builds will among network participants. • We revisit and update the aim as we learn together and/or conditions change. • Our target-setting work has led to small or large positive changes on student indicators or outcomes.
Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	
Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	



I. Continuous Improvement: Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Understand the System	<p>Definition: Demonstrated strengths in leveraging research, data, and practical knowledge to build, articulate, and iterate on a shared theory of how to reach the defined aim.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We use processes for engaging various types of expertise (e.g. lived experience, research, data & analytics, content knowledge, pedagogy, community engagement) throughout the development and evolution of the theory. • Our theory clearly articulates the causal relationships between change ideas, drivers, and outcomes, and the evidence base supporting those relationships. • We support network members to collaborate with students, families, researchers, content experts, and other key stakeholders when developing their theory of improvement. • We have created a visual representation of the theory of practice improvement that informs the work of the network. • Our network's theory draws on knowledge of evidence-based practices, high-leverage processes, and local contexts to support our students. • We developed a set of indicators to assess whether our theory is leading to the aim we seek. • We revisit and update the theory as we learn together and/or conditions change.
Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	
Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	



I. Continuous Improvement: Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Understand the System	<p>Definition: Ability to help teams identify logical and relevant strategies, implement and use feedback and data to test those strategies, reflect, and take action based on what they learned.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have led school teams through a series of frequent and connected inquiry cycles that, where possible, build off improvement efforts already in progress. • We provide a set of tools (e.g. PDSA forms, quality rubrics) and processes to assist each school team in developing change ideas, assessing the effectiveness of their inquiry cycles, identifying system barriers (if any), and making measurable progress. • We have content experts on staff or in our network of close collaborators who can help network members develop evidence-based culturally-relevant pedagogy and practices related to the aim and theory. • We have improvement coaches with experience running inquiry cycles that include evidence of improvement from their testing. • Our improvement coaching capacity (team size, time allocation per staff member, supplemental resources) matches the scope of our project. • We intentionally customize our coaching to each school throughout their inquiry cycles. • We help school teams build routines to collaborate with students, families, or other key stakeholders in their efforts to figure out where and what to test. • Our coaches work to build network member ownership through peer-to-peer collaboration to sustain inquiry cycle implementation over time.
Build Commitment to a Clear & Specific Aim	
Develop a Shared Theory of Practice Improvement	
Support Disciplined Inquiry Cycles	



Capacity Group: Network Initiation, Management & Support

These are the capacities necessary to successfully run a network and leverage that network for long-term improvement and scale.

II. Network Initiation, Management & Support: Network Initiation	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Network Initiation	<p>Definition: Ability to identify, recruit, onboard, and set clear expectations, roles, and responsibilities for network members.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a clearly defined vetting process to determine the network membership. • Our recruitment process involves school and district leaders and is designed to result in a diverse network who can bring perspectives aligned to those of our target population. • We collaborate with school and district leaders to develop and implement an onboarding process for new school teams, and support the schools we work with to develop and implement a similar process for new team members. • We support school leaders in developing and communicating shared expectations for each individual in the network, and practice an inclusive process of revisiting and revising those expectations. • We follow a process to co-create network norms with all members and hold one another accountable to the norms. • The schools and districts we bring together exhibit a similar underlying commitment to the goals we are trying to achieve (e.g., through their time commitment, inclusion in strategic plans). • We work to align the work of the network with school and district-level priorities. We can clearly articulate the alignment between the network aims and the needs and priorities of each school and district. • We have a network development framework and plan for each year of the network that guides how we scope and sequence activities during the initiation phase (and beyond).
Network Cohesion	
Network Management	
Network Member Development	
Knowledge Management	



II. Network Initiation, Management & Support: Network Cohesion	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Network Initiation	<p>Definition: Demonstrated ability to intentionally shape interactions and connections between network members to deepen a community-aligned identity, exchange knowledge through shared learning, and interact regularly around common problems of practice.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have experience leading collaborative work between individuals and teams who both have and haven't worked together in the past. • We are skilled in facilitation methods that create a safe and inclusive environment so we can have honest conversations about equity from the outset, and routines to check in with network members to ensure this culture is sustained over time. • We follow a process for helping network members connect their own personal goals or stories to the goals of the network to build a collective narrative. • We lead groups through activities to surface biases and power imbalances across team members and/or schools, and reflect on how those factors impact their ability to work together. • We use structures and practices for fostering connections within and across school teams that persist independent of our involvement as the intermediary. • We develop rituals for sharing learning and celebrating successes using evidence. • We have a routine for evaluating, monitoring, and adjusting our network cohesion strategy as connections and relationships develop and change over time.
Network Cohesion	
Network Management	
Network Member Development	
Knowledge Management	



II. Network Initiation, Management & Support: Network Management	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Network Initiation	<p>Definition: Experience developing and following an intentional plan of routines and activities with network members, while responding to data and feedback, to ensure the network maintains momentum and stays on track.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a project management plan for network activities that allows for responsive conversations and learning but is otherwise established early and adhered to for consistency, predictability, and support. • We establish an engagement plan with each school that includes helping them identify a team structure that promotes distributed leadership, form improvement routines, and stay on track with their inquiry cycles. • We provide network members with timely logistical information from which they can easily plan. • We meet regularly with district leaders to maintain alignment between network activities and district-level efforts and priorities. • We have a communication strategy to ensure all relevant information is disseminated and up-to-date. • We have a routine for collecting and analyzing feedback from network members about their network experience and the health of the network, including interactions with the intermediary and potential power dynamics.
Network Cohesion	
Network Management	
Network Member Development	
Knowledge Management	



II. Network Initiation, Management & Support: Network Member Development	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Network Initiation	<p>Definition: Ability to design and execute inclusive and engaging in-person or virtual gatherings of network members focused on accelerating participants' knowledge, skills, learning, and connection.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We know best practices for adult learning and apply them to achieve a set of outcomes with groups of adults. • We have a capability-building plan that informs how we design gatherings and differentiate to each set of participants. • We routinely identify content knowledge or skill gaps and potential biases in the network and intentionally bring in partners to build network member skills in these areas. • We design and facilitate our network gatherings to ensure equitable participation. • We have routines for self- and collective-reflection that deepen the learning, relationships, and functioning of our network teams. • We have a routine for collecting and analyzing feedback and evidence from network gatherings and making improvements based upon the results. • Our work building individuals' and/or teams' improvement knowledge leads to tangible mindset shifts (e.g. from avoiding challenges to embracing them, from ignoring feedback to seeking and learning from it) among participants.
Network Cohesion	
Network Management	
Network Member Development	
Knowledge Management	



II. Network Initiation, Management & Support: Knowledge Management

Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Network Initiation	<p>Definition: Experience developing and managing routines to surface lessons from research and practice, consolidate or adapt where necessary, and make readily available to network members on a shared platform to accelerate learning.</p>
Network Cohesion	<p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have refined processes and/or protocols for sharing lessons, building knowledge, codifying practices, and sharing knowledge across our network.
Network Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have allocated personnel to managing and maintaining the cohesion and usability of our knowledge management system. • We have an onboarding process for how to contribute to and use our knowledge management system.
Network Member Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our network members habitually use our knowledge management system and report that they have applied knowledge from the system to their practice.
Knowledge Management	



Capacity Group: Measurement & Data for Improvement

This category is designed to communicate about the importance of measurement to the CI process, as well as to be able to appropriately support capacity-building for organizations.

III. Measurement & Data for Improvement: Data Infrastructure	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Data Infrastructure	<p>Definition: Ability to reliably and securely collect, connect, manage, and report data from across the network.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a data system that allows school-level leaders and teachers to contribute and visualize rapid-cycle and testing data in a timely, accessible and actionable way. • Our platform is easy for school teams to use and training and support is available when people need help using it. • We collect data from a variety of sources and platforms (as needed), in partnership with schools and districts. • We have data sharing agreements and protocols with our schools, districts, and partner organizations (if relevant), including ensuring privacy and security. • We foster working relationships with personnel in charge of key data infrastructure at schools, districts, and partner organizations (if relevant) to help us obtain timely and accurate data related to the aim and theory.
Analytics, Measurement, & Evaluation	
Practical Measurement	



III. Measurement & Data for Improvement: Analytics, Measurement, & Evaluation	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Data Infrastructure	<p>Definition: Ability to collect, analyze, and report on data to determine where, whether, and how the network is moving toward the aim, as well as to share and celebrate successes.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We conduct a variety of analyses and develop reports with effective visualizations to communicate progress to schools. • We disaggregate data by schools, subgroups, and other dimensions to identify variation within a group of schools and/or a group of students. • We lead the network in discussing important differences between types of data and co-create norms around how we will use data. • We work with our network to understand how data and evidence can be used in both culturally-responsive ways, and in ways that perpetuate systemic inequities, and we take action to ensure that data does not serve as a driver to uphold inequitable systems and structures. • We have staff with the skills to conduct analyses to assess whether the actual changes led to improvement in the outcome of interest. • We can perform ad-hoc data analyses across data from multiple sources to support school teams. • Our analyses have informed continuous improvement efforts at the local level. • We can connect the practical measures that teams collect as part of their inquiry cycles to the aim and work of the network.
Analytics, Measurement, & Evaluation	
Practical Measurement	



III. Measurement & Data for Improvement: Practical Measurement	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Data Infrastructure	<p>Definition: Experience successfully helping improvement teams identify, collect, analyze, and discuss the data necessary to understand if and how disciplined inquiry cycles are having intended effects for the population they are designed to reach.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our network-facing staff demonstrate experience teaching adults how to identify, collect, analyze and discuss data to measure small tests of change in an inquiry cycle. • We have network-facing staff (e.g. improvement coaches, data specialists) knowledgeable in practical measurement for improvement. • We provide a set of protocols and tools to help teams collect, analyze and discuss evidence and data with an equity lens. • We have a shared philosophy and guidance on determining the quality of data grounded in equitable practices and principles. • We have routines involving students, families, or other key stakeholders in our efforts to understand if and how our change ideas impact students.
Analytics, Measurement, & Evaluation	
Practical Measurement	



Capacity Group: Inclusive Culture

This is the set of capacities that recognize the critical importance of DEI and authentic voice to any improvement effort focusing on students.

IV: Inclusive Culture: DEI	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	<p>Definition: Ability to create an environment of involvement, respect, connection, and empowerment among team members from a wide range of identities, perspectives, and experiences so they can work across schools to ensure that student access, participation, and outcomes are not correlated with demographic factors.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a clear understanding of the state of diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) across our organization, and a plan to build on strengths and address gaps. • We analyze and improve our policies, processes, and practices to ensure that the demographics of stakeholders at every level of our organization are representative of the populations we serve. • We push for equity in our hiring, promotion, and compensation decisions. • Team members from diverse backgrounds and identities report that they experience a sense of inclusion and belonging, and feel empowered by our policies and practices around information-sharing and decision-making. • We analyze and improve our policies, processes, and practices to ensure that access and outcomes are not correlated with demographics.
Student Agency	
Family & Community Engagement	



IV. Inclusive Culture: Student Agency	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	<p>Definition: Ability to support school-based teams to meaningfully include students in the improvement process by creating frequent, supportive, and inclusive opportunities for dialogue, input, reflection, analysis, and co-creation of action steps.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We work alongside our improvement team(s) to elevate student voice and agency as often as we can. • Students are members of our improvement team and have an active role and voice in our work. • Our work with schools has resulted in authentic student participation in improvement work.
Student Agency	
Family & Community Engagement	



IV. Inclusive Culture: Family & Community Engagement	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	<p>Definition: Ability to support school and district leaders to meaningfully include families, and the community in the improvement process by creating frequent, supportive, and inclusive opportunities for dialogue, input, reflection, analysis, and co-creation of action steps.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We work alongside our improvement team(s) to elevate the voices of families and community members as often as we can. • Families and/or community members are members of our improvement team and have an active role and voice in our work. • Our work with families and communities has resulted in authentic participation in improvement work.
Student Agency	
Family & Community Engagement	



Capacity Group: Leadership Support

This capacity group represents the set of skills that ensure improvement teams are well-supported in their improvement efforts.

V. Leadership Support: School Leadership & Leader Support	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
School Leadership & Leader Support	<p>Definition: Experience supporting school leaders to exhibit consistent, supportive, and inclusive leadership in schools to build a healthy culture for staff and students.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have supported school leaders to demonstrate their commitment to improvement work in their schools (e.g. by reallocating time for each member to engage in adult learning and collaboration toward the aim, personally participating in network activities, building distributed leadership among educators and staff at their school, being willing to test changes to inequitable or oppressive policies and practices). • We engage school leaders in a periodic progress review and reflection, leveraging a wide variety of data such as network activity data, data from improvement cycles, school climate/health data, and student performance. • We engage school leaders in processes to align values with actions in support of success for students in their defined student population. • Among our network-facing staff, we have influence with and the respect of school leaders. • We have a routine for collecting and analyzing feedback from school leaders on our work and debriefing and improving our support to school leaders based on the evidence.
District Leadership & Leader Support	



V. Leadership Support: District Leadership & Leader Support	
Capacities	Definition and Look-Fors
School Leadership & Leader Support	<p>Definition: Experience supporting district leaders to exhibit consistent, strategic, and inclusive leadership across district departments and schools to ensure the work of the NSI remains a top priority.</p> <p>Look-Fors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have supported district leaders to exhibit their commitment to supporting improvement work in schools (e.g. by reallocating time for school leaders to engage in adult learning and collaboration, supporting school leaders' participation in network activities, being willing to test changes to inequitable or oppressive policies and practices at the system level). • We engage district leaders in a periodic progress review and reflection, leveraging a wide variety of data such as network activity data, data from improvement cycles, school system health assessments, and student performance. • We engage district leaders in processes to align values with actions in support of success for students in their defined student population. • Among our staff or network of close collaborators, we have influence with and the respect of district leaders. • We have a routine for collecting and analyzing feedback from district leaders on our work and debriefing and improving our support to district leaders based on the evidence.
District Leadership & Leader Support	



Appendix C: ICAF Research Notes

Capacity Group	Inputs/Support Research
Continuous Improvement	AIR's IFS Self-Assessment: <i>Motivate and Drive Transformation, Manage Knowledge, Utilize Strategic Approaches to Support and Scale.</i> CPRL's Networks for School Improvement: A Review of the Literature. Kaplan and Norton (1992). The Balanced Scorecard -- Measures that Drive Performance. HBR.
Network Management, Initiation & Support	AIR's IFS Self-Assessment: <i>Cross-Cutting Enablers, Manage Knowledge, Oversee Network Design and Operation, Motivate and Drive Transformation.</i> CPRL's Networks for School Improvement: A Review of the Literature. Russell, et. al. A Framework for the Initiation of Networked Improvement Communities
Measurement & Data for Improvement	CPRL's Networks for School Improvement: A Review of the Literature. AIR's IFS Self-Assessment. <i>Utilize Strategic Approaches to Support and Scale.</i> Yeager, D., Bryk, A. S., Muhich, J., Hausman, H., & Morales, L. (2013). Practical measurement . Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Stanford, CA.
Inclusive Culture	AIR's IFS Self-Assessment. <i>Cross-Cutting Enablers.</i> Harvard Family Research Project archives (separated from HGSE to become the Global Family Research Project in 2017). Example sources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvard Family Research Project (July 27, 2016). Harvard Family Research Project Resources: Family and Community Engagement in the Transition to Kindergarten • McWilliams, Lorette (June 22, 2016). How to Grow a Framework: Lessons from California. • Rowland, Allison (July 26, 2016). Three Lessons in Developing a Systemic Approach to Family Engagement. • Walsh, Barri (2015). Family Engagement -- Equitable and Everywhere.
Network Member Development	AIR's IFS Self-Assessment, <i>Manage Knowledge, Cross-Cutting Enablers, Oversee Network Design and Operation.</i> CPRL's Networks for School Improvement: A Review of the Literature.

