



Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)

Score Report Feedback for Task 2:

Supporting Continuous Professional Development

Score Level 4.....	2
Score Level 3.....	4
Score Level 2.....	6
Score Level 1.....	8
Score Level 0.....	10

Score Level 4

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

2.1.1. The response provides evidence that individuals were thoroughly involved in developing the prioritized list and includes detailed reasons for their selection. Evidence shows that the team used an in-depth process to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goal(s). Your response demonstrates that the team collected appropriate data, that the data were used insightfully to assist in prioritizing the list of significant professional development needs, and that the data are tightly aligned with building, district, and/or state goal(s). Your analysis demonstrates a significant connection between prioritized needs, the building, district, and/or the state goal(s).

2.1.2. The response provides evidence that the selection of need(s) from the prioritized list is significant and that your choices are supported with an extensive rationale. Goals for the professional development plan are explained insightfully, and the discussion of the criteria used to determine whether the goal(s) are achieved is extensive. Thorough evidence of the professional development plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning is provided. The response includes identifying substantive research to support the professional development. It provides a thorough discussion of the connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. The explanation of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development is detailed. Evidence of the significant involvement of individuals in creating the professional development plan is provided, and the response includes an extensive rationale for choosing these individuals. The response consists of a description of significant follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, with a thorough rationale for choosing the follow-up plan.

Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development

2.2.1. The response thoroughly discusses strategies and/or techniques chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, with an in-depth rationale for the choices. You demonstrate that significant individuals were selected to participate in the professional development and support these selections with detailed rationales. There is a thorough explanation and a detailed rationale for the approaches to facilitate the professional development. Impactful strategies to actively engage the participants are explained and supported with an in-depth rationale. There is an extensive description of the expected impact that the assignments given to participants and/or students had on instructional practice and student learning, and a significant connection is drawn between the assignments and the implementation of the professional development plan.

Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

2.3.1. The response provides evidence that three significant participants with different levels of experience were chosen to determine the impact of the professional development;

thorough rationales are provided for selecting the participants. There is detailed evidence of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of **each** participant, with extensive examples provided for support, including from the walk-through observation form. Your response identifies a significant follow-up method for **each** participant and supports your choices with an in-depth rationale. The impact of **each** participant's professional development on student learning is analyzed thoroughly, and you develop significant and tightly aligned examples from the student work sample to support the conclusions.

Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

2.4.1. The response draws insightful conclusions from the feedback survey results that are used to determine the effectiveness of the professional development experience for the participants. The examples from the feedback survey used in support of the conclusions are consistent and substantive. The response describes perceptive modifications that could be made to the current professional development process, supported by extensive rationales based on **all** aspects of the professional development experience. The implications of how **all** aspects of the professional development experience will support continuous professional development are discussed insightfully. **All** aspects of the professional development plan are reflected upon substantially. Their implications are used to insightfully determine how the experience might have a long-term impact on improving the school culture.

Score Level 3

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

2.1.1. The response provides evidence that individuals were appropriately involved in developing the prioritized list and includes clear reasons for their selection. Evidence shows that the team used an informed process to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goal(s). Your response demonstrates that the team collected appropriate data, that the data were used accurately to assist in prioritizing the list of significant professional development needs, and that the data are clearly aligned with building, district, and/or state goals. Further evidence of research-based support for the plan may be needed. Your analysis demonstrates an effective connection between prioritized needs, the building, district, and/or the state goal(s).

2.1.2. The response provides evidence that selecting the need(s) from the prioritized list is appropriate and that your choices are supported with a logical rationale. Goals for the professional development plan are explained effectively, and the discussion of the criteria to determine whether the goal(s) are achieved is logical. Effective evidence of the professional development plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning is provided. The response includes identifying relevant research to support the professional development. It provides an effective discussion of the connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. The explanation of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development is complete. Evidence of the appropriate involvement of individuals in creating the professional development plan is provided, and the response includes a clear rationale for choosing these individuals. The response consists of a description of effective follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, with an appropriate rationale for selecting the follow-up plan.

Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development

2.2.1. The response provides a clear discussion of appropriate strategies and/or techniques chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, with a relevant rationale for the choices. You demonstrate that appropriate individuals were selected to participate in the professional development and support these selections with effective rationales. There is an appropriate and logical rationale for the approaches to facilitate the professional development. Appropriate strategies to actively engage the participants are explained and supported with an effective rationale. There is a relevant description of the expected impact that the assignments given to participants and/or students had on instructional practice and student learning, and an informed connection is drawn between the assignments and the implementation of the professional development plan.

Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

2.3.1. The response provides evidence that three appropriate participants with different

levels of experience were chosen to determine the impact of the professional development; logical rationales are provided for selecting the participants. There is appropriate evidence of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of **each** participant, with relevant examples provided for support, including from the walk-through observation form. Your response identifies an informed follow-up method for **each** participant and supports your choices with a connected rationale. The impact of **each** participant's professional development on student learning is analyzed completely, and you develop relevant and aligned examples from the student work sample to support the conclusions, but further examples from the student work may be needed to show the impact more clearly.

Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

2.4.1. The response draws effective conclusions from the feedback survey results that are used to determine the effectiveness of the professional development experience for the participants. The examples from the feedback survey used in support are clear and informed. The response describes relevant modifications that could be made to the current professional development process, supported by an effective rationale based on **all** aspects of the professional development experience. The implications of how **all** aspects of the professional development experience will support continuous professional development are discussed effectively. **All** aspects of the professional development plan are reflected upon appropriately. Their implications are used to effectively determine how the experience might have a long-term impact on improving the school culture.

Score Level 2

Three kinds of writing are required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. When a guiding prompt requests a rationale or an explanation, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. Responses at this score level may fail to respond completely to **all** parts of the guiding prompts, and their analysis may be limited or vague. Also, consider the comments that follow.

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

2.1.1. The response's description of the involvement of individuals in developing the prioritized list may be limited, and/or the reasons for their selection may be partial. There may be evidence that the team used a limited process to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goal(s), and/or the alignment may be partial. The data collected to assist in prioritizing the list of needs may not be entirely appropriate, and/or the explanation of the data and/or its use may be cursory. The connection between prioritized needs, the building, district, and/or the state goal(s) may be partial or vague.

2.1.2. The response may provide evidence that the selection of need(s) chosen from the prioritized list is loosely connected to the goal(s) and/or that your choices are supported with a partial or confusing rationale. Goals for the professional development plan may be incompletely developed, and/or discussing the criteria to determine whether the goal(s) are achieved may be vague. Limited evidence of the professional development plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning may be provided. The response may be limited in identifying relevant research to support the professional development, and/or it may describe an uneven connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. The discussion of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development may be partial. Evidence of the appropriate involvement of individuals in creating the professional development plan may be limited, and/or the response may include a partial or vague rationale for choosing these individuals. The response may consist of a cursory or partial description of follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, and/or the rationale for the follow-up may be vague or limited.

Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development

2.2.1. The response may provide a cursory discussion of appropriate strategies and/or techniques chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, and/or the strategies and/or techniques may themselves be vague. The rationales used to support those choices may be incomplete or vague. The strategies and/or techniques may also be loosely connected to the plan's goals. There may be limited evidence that appropriate individuals were selected to participate in the professional development, and/or these selections may be supported with an incomplete rationale. There may be a vague

discussion of the approaches used to facilitate the professional development, and/or the rationales used to support the selected approaches may be confusing; the identified approaches may also be cursory. The strategies used to engage the participants actively may be vague and/or loosely connected to facilitating engagement. The rationales for selecting the strategies may also be uneven. There may be a limited description of the expected impact that the assignments given to participants and/or students had on instructional practice and student learning, and/or a cursory or confusing connection may be drawn between the assignments and the implementation of the professional development plan.

Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

2.3.1. The response may provide incomplete evidence for the appropriate selection of three participants with different levels of experience; rationales for including **each** participant may be limited or vague. The explanation of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of **each** participant may be uneven or confusing, and/or may be supported with partial or cursory examples. The description of and/or the rationale for the follow-up method for **each** participant may be limited or vague. There may be cursory discussion of the impact of **each** participant's professional development on student learning, and/or the analysis of the examples used to support the conclusions from the student work sample may be limited or confusing.

Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

2.4.1. The response may draw limited or uneven conclusions from the results of the feedback survey that determine the effectiveness of the professional development experience for the participants. The examples from the feedback survey may be incomplete or vague. The feedback survey design may have included global topics to elicit a response from the participants, and/or there may be an inconsistent or partial analysis of the feedback. The description of the modifications that could be made to the current professional development process may be partial or vague, and/or the modifications may be supported by a rationale that is partial or loosely connected to an analysis of **all** the aspects of the professional development experience. The implications of how **all** aspects of the professional development experience will support continuous professional development may be only partially examined. The reflection on **all** aspects of the professional development plan to determine how the experience might have a long-term impact on improving the school culture may be partial or loosely connected to the plan's goals.

Score Level 1

Three kinds of writing are required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 1 contains one or more of the following features: selection of building-level professional development experience that does not impact instructional practice and student learning; provides little or no evidence of colleagues' involvement; contains analysis and/or reflection that is trivial or weak. Responses at this score level may fail to provide a complete response to **all** the guiding prompts, and the analysis they provide may be trivial or uninformed.

As you read through your submitted response, compare what you have written to the requirements of the guiding prompts. When a guiding prompt requests a rationale or examples, consider the evidence that you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. In addition, think about how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also, consider the comments that follow.

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

2.1.1. The response's description of the involvement of individuals in the development of the prioritized list may be minimal, and/or the participants themselves may be inappropriate. The explanation of the reasons for their selection may be minimal. There may be evidence that the team used an ineffective process to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goal(s), and/or the alignment may be inappropriate. The data collected to assist in prioritizing the list of professional development needs may be inappropriate, and/or the explanation of the data and/or its use may be ineffective. The connection between prioritized needs, the building, district, and/or the state goal(s) may be weak or trivial.

2.1.2. The response may provide evidence that the selection of need(s) chosen from the prioritized list is inappropriate and/or that your choices are supported with an illogical rationale. Goals for the professional development plan may be inappropriate, and/or discussing the criteria to determine whether the goal(s) are achieved may be illogical. Ineffective evidence of the professional development plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning may be provided. The response may be ineffective in identifying research to support the identified focus of the professional development plan, and/or it may describe a minimal or weak connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. The discussion of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development may be minimal. Evidence of the appropriate involvement of individuals in creating the professional development plan may be ineffective, and/or the response may include a weak rationale for choosing these individuals. The response may consist of an ineffective description of follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, and/or the rationale for the follow-up may be inappropriate.

Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development

2.2.1. The response may provide a minimal discussion of appropriate strategies and/or techniques chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, and/or the strategies and/or techniques themselves may be inappropriate or trivial. The rationales used to support those choices may be minimal. The strategies and/or techniques may also illogically connect to the plan's goals. There may be minimal evidence that appropriate individuals were selected to participate in the professional development, and/or these selections may be supported with trivial rationales. The individuals who were selected may also be inappropriate. There may be an ineffective discussion of the approaches used to facilitate the professional development, and/or the rationales used to support the selected approaches may be minimal; the identified approaches may be trivial. The strategies used to engage the participants actively may be inappropriate or illogically connected to facilitating engagement. The rationales for selecting the strategies may be minimal or absent. There may be an ineffective or illogical discussion of the expected impact that the assignments given to participants and/or students had on instructional practice and student learning, and/or little or no connection may be drawn between the assignments and the professional development plan.

Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

2.3.1. The response may provide incomplete evidence for the appropriate selection of three participants with different experience levels; rationales for including **each** participant may be minimal or absent. The explanation of how the professional development experience influenced the instructional practices of **each** participant may be minimal and/or may be supported with trivial or irrelevant rationales. The description of and/or the rationale for the follow-up method for **each** participant may be minimal or inappropriate. There may be little or no discussion of the impact of **each** participant's professional development on student learning, and/or the discussion of the examples used to support the conclusions from the student work sample may be minimal or missing.

Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

2.4.1. The response may draw minimal, if any, conclusions from the results of the feedback survey that determine the effectiveness of the professional development experience for the participants. The examples from the feedback survey may be ineffective or absent. The feedback survey design may have included inappropriate topics to elicit a response from the participants, and/or there may be minimal or inaccurate analysis of the feedback. The description of the modifications that could be made to the current professional development process may be minimal or missing, and/or the modifications may be supported by a rationale that is trivial or disconnected from an analysis of **all** the aspects of the professional development experience. The implications of how **all** aspects of the professional development experience will support continuous professional development may be minimally or ineffectively examined. The reflection on **all** aspects of the professional development plan to determine how the experience might have a long-term

impact on improving the school culture may be minimal or inappropriate.

Score Level 0

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered “unacceptable” and “Not Scoreable” because of insufficient evidence. As you read through your submitted response, review your artifacts and think about what kind of evidence you need to submit to support the choices and/or decisions you described in your written commentary. Also, return to the Submission System to confirm that what you attached was legible and did not contain hyperlinks. A Zero is assigned to Step 1 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in the Task 2—Step 1 textboxes.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 1.
- The written response is attached as a standalone document rather than directly in the textbox provided.
- There is a technical difficulty with the artifact attachment (e.g., the artifact is corrupt or will not open, is unreadable and/or indecipherable, or contains only hyperlinks).
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 2 textboxes.
 - Representative page from the prioritized list
 - Representative pages from the professional development plan
 - Representative page from the research (e.g., a bibliography, a specific online resource, or a district source)

Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered “unacceptable” and “Not Scoreable” because of insufficient evidence. As you read through your submitted response, review your artifacts and think about what kind of evidence you need to submit to support the choices and/or decisions you described in your written commentary. Also, return to the Submission System to confirm that what you attached was legible and did not contain hyperlinks. A Zero is assigned to Step 2 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in the Task 2—Step 2 textbox.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 2.

- The written response is attached as a standalone document rather than directly in the textbox provided.
- There is a technical difficulty with the artifact attachment (e.g., the artifact is corrupt or will not open, is unreadable and/or indecipherable, or contains only hyperlinks).
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 2 textboxes.
 - Representative page of an assignment given to teachers and/or students

Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered “unacceptable” and “Not Scoreable” because of insufficient evidence. As you read through your submitted response, review your artifacts and think about what kind of evidence you need to submit to support the choices and/or decisions you described in your written commentary. Also, return to the Submission System to confirm that what you attached was legible and did not contain hyperlinks. A Zero is assigned to Step 3 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in the Task 2—Step 3 textbox.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 3.
- The written response is attached as a standalone document rather than directly in the textbox provided.
- There is a technical difficulty with the artifact attachment (e.g., the artifact is corrupt or will not open, is unreadable and/or indecipherable, or contains only hyperlinks).
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 2 textboxes.
 - Representative page from a walk-through observation form completed for one teacher
 - Representative page of a student work sample from one student

Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered “unacceptable” and “Not Scoreable” because of insufficient evidence. As you read through your submitted response, review your artifacts and think about what kind of evidence you need to submit to support the choices and/or decisions you described in your written commentary. Also, return to the Submission System to confirm that what you attached was legible and did not contain hyperlinks. A Zero is assigned to Step 4 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in the Task 2—Step 4 textbox.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 4.
- The written response is attached as a standalone document rather than directly in the textbox provided.
- There is a technical difficulty with the artifact attachment (e.g., the artifact is corrupt or will not open, is unreadable and/or indecipherable, or contains only hyperlinks).
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 2 textboxes.
 - Representative page from a feedback survey completed after the professional development