ets

Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)

Score Report Feedback for Task 3:

Creating a Collaborative Culture

Score Level 4

Step 1: Identifying the Collaborative Team

3.1.1. The response provides thorough evidence that three to five colleagues with varying levels of experience and who could make significant contributions were selected to serve as team members; the rationales for their inclusion are detailed and tightly connected to the team's goals. You describe insightful steps taken to elicit and encourage **each** colleague's involvement with the team and provide thorough rationales for choosing those steps. The structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work is significant, and its selection is supported with an extensive rationale.

Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.2.1. The response provides evidence of the insightful selection of tool(s) used to collect data to identify a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement. Your choice of tool(s) is tightly connected to the instructional practice being assessed, and you demonstrate that the selection of the instructional need to target is thoroughly supported by the data collected. Detailed rationales demonstrate that the targeted area of research-based instructional practice and the steps taken to measure the intended impact of the plan on student learning are significant. Your data analysis results in an in-depth plan that includes tightly connected goals, steps, timelines, and resources, supported with a thorough rationale. You provide firmly grounded and extensive reasons for choosing the colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan. There is a thorough explanation of the impact that the collaborative team plan will have on improving the school's culture.

3.2.2. The response provides substantive evidence of the selection of insightful strategies used with team members, **both individually and as a group**, to involve them in the planning process, and the use of the strategies is supported with thorough examples. You describe significant strategies implemented to ensure that all team members were allowed a voice during the planning so that they could provide meaningful input related to the goal(s); the strategies you chose are supported with detailed examples. Your response thoroughly explains the challenges encountered during the planning and provides an in-depth discussion of the team's resolution of those challenges. Your choice of actions to resolve the challenges is supported by an extensive rationale. There is thorough evidence of significant steps taken to reach consensus among the team members while creating the plan, supported with extensive examples.

Step 3: Implementing the Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.3.1. The response provides evidence that the steps taken by the collaborative team to implement the plan were significant and supports **each** step with a thorough rationale. Thorough evidence establishes that **each** team member assumed significant

responsibilities while implementing the plan. The feedback provided detailed evidence that targeted encouragement was offered to team members, including the circumstances under which the targeted encouragement was offered and the reasons for offering it. You provide an in-depth description of the method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and insightfully examine the feedback's impact on the plan and the team's work. Supporting examples of the method and the impact are tightly connected to the plan's goals. The steps taken by the team to ensure that the plan's implementation impacted student learning are consistent and thoroughly defined. The process used by the team to collect the evidence of student learning is significant and well defined, and supporting examples taken from the student work are tightly connected to measuring the impact on student learning. The response insightfully addresses the challenges that arose during the plan's implementation and describes highly effective steps taken by the team to address the challenges. The steps taken by the team are supported by examples that are tightly connected to addressing the particular challenges that arose.

Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture

3.4.1. The response provides evidence of thoroughly evaluating the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered. Supporting examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video are extensive. The evaluation of the extent to which team members experienced professional growth working as partners in the collaborative team is insightful and is supported by detailed examples from the video. The response insightfully describes significant steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement in the collaborative team. The steps taken to promote self-reflection are supported with insightful examples from the video. The response provides evidence of insightful reflection on how the feedback from team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams. The reflection is supported by examples from the artifacts and/or video that are tightly connected to thoughts about future collaborative work. The response insightfully reflects on how the work of the collaborative team will serve as a means for positive change in the future and consistently connects specific aspects of the team's work to the impact it had on the school's culture.

Score Level 3

Step 1: Identifying the Collaborative Team

3.1.1. The response provides effective evidence that three to five colleagues who have varying levels of experience and could make significant contributions were selected to serve as team members; the rationale for their inclusion is informed and clearly connected to the team's goals. You describe effective steps taken to elicit and encourage **each** colleague's involvement with the team and provide appropriate rationales for choosing those steps. The structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work is effective, and its selection is supported with an appropriate rationale.

Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.2.1. The response provides evidence of the appropriate selection of tool(s) used to collect data to identify a research-based instructional practice needing improvement. Your choice of tool(s) is connected to the instructional practice being assessed, and you demonstrate that the selection of the instructional need to target is effectively supported by the data collected. Relevant rationales demonstrate that the targeted area of research-based instructional practice and the steps taken to measure the intended impact of the plan on student learning are informed. There is a clear connection between the developed plan and the collected and analyzed data. Your analysis of the data results in an informed plan that includes clearly connected goals, steps, a timeline, and resources, and that is supported with effective rationales. You provide informed reasons for choosing the colleagues targeted as the focus of the team's plan. There is an effective explanation of the impact that the plan for the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school's culture.

3.2.2. The response provides effective evidence of the selection of appropriate strategies used with team members, **both individually and as a group**, to involve them in the planning process, and the use of the strategies is supported with appropriate examples. You describe effective strategies that were used to ensure that all team members were allowed a voice during the planning to provide meaningful input related to the goals; the strategies you chose are supported with appropriate examples. Your response provides a logical explanation of the challenges encountered during the planning and an effective discussion of the team's resolution of those challenges. Your choice of actions to resolve the challenges is supported with an appropriate rationale. There is clear evidence of informed steps taken to reach consensus among the team members while creating the plan, supported with appropriate examples.

Step 3: Implementing the Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.3.1. The response provides evidence that the steps taken by the collaborative team to

implement the plan were relevant and supports **each** step with a relevant rationale. Appropriate evidence establishes that **each** team member assumed responsibilities while implementing the plan. The feedback discussed provides effective evidence that targeted encouragement was offered to team members, including the circumstances under which the targeted encouragement was offered and the reasons for offering it. You give a complete description of an effective method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and appropriately examine the feedback's impact on the plan and the team's work. Supporting examples of the method and the impact are connected to the goal(s) of the plan. The steps taken by the team to ensure that the plan's implementation impacted student learning are logical and clearly defined. The process used by the team to collect the evidence of student learning is clear and effective, and supporting examples taken from the student work are connected to measuring the impact on student learning. The response effectively addresses the challenges that arose during the plan's implementation and describes appropriate steps taken by the team to address the challenges. The steps taken by the team are supported by examples that address the particular challenges that arose.

Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture

3.4.1. The response provides evidence of effectively evaluating the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered. Supporting examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video are appropriate. The evaluation of the extent to which team members experienced professional growth working as partners in the collaborative team is informed and supported by effective examples from the video. The response describes logical steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement on the collaborative team. Effective examples from the video support the steps taken to promote self-reflection. The response provides evidence of effective reflection on how the feedback from team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams. The reflection is supported by examples from the artifacts and/or video that are connected to thoughts about future collaborative work. The response effectively reflects on how the work of the collaborative team will serve as a means for positive change in the future and connects specific aspects of the team's work to the impact it had on the school's 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: Identifying the Collaborative Team

3.1.1. The response may provide cursory evidence that three to five appropriate colleagues with varying levels of experience and who could make significant contributions were selected to serve as team members; the rationales for their inclusion may be partial or loosely connected to the team's goals. Steps taken to elicit and encourage **each** colleague's involvement with the team may be limited; evidence of encouragement for **each** colleague may be uneven or inconsistent, and/or the rationales may be incomplete. The description of the structure put in place to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work may be partial, and/or its selection may be supported with an inconsistent rationale.

Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.2.1. The response may provide partial evidence of the appropriate selection of tool(s) used to collect data to identify a research-based instructional practice needing improvement. The data may lack detail or be tangential, and/or the response may provide limited rationales for selecting the tool(s). The choice of tool(s) may be loosely connected to the instructional practice being assessed, and/or the selection of the instructional need to target may be loosely supported by the data collected. The tool(s) used to collect data to identify a research-based instructional practice that needs improvement may be limited, and/or the description of the targeted area of need may be partial. The plan may be based on a cursory analysis of the data. There may be limited evidence of steps taken to measure the intended impact, and/or the supporting rationales may be partial. The plan description, goals, strategies, and resources may be cursory, and/or they may be supported with incomplete rationales. The response may provide a limited discussion of the colleagues who were targeted as the focus of the team's plan, and/or the reasons for selecting them may be cursory or tangential. There may be a partial explanation of the expected impact that the plan for the collaborative team might have on the improvement of the school culture.

3.2.2. The response may provide limited evidence of the selection of appropriate strategies used with team members, **both individually and as a group**, to involve them

in the planning process, and/or the use of the strategies may be supported with partial examples. The description of the strategies that were used to ensure that all team members were allowed a voice during the planning so that they could provide meaningful input related to the goals may be limited, and/or the strategies chosen may be supported with loosely connected supporting examples. The response may provide a partial description of the challenges encountered during the planning and/or team resolution of those challenges, and/or the resolution itself may be inconsistent. The choice of actions to resolve the challenges may be supported with an incomplete or vague rationale. There may be limited evidence of informed steps taken to reach consensus among the team members while creating the plan, and/or the supporting examples may be partial.

Step 3: Implementing the Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.3.1. The response may describe partial steps that were taken by the collaborative team to implement the plan, and/or the supporting rationales for **each** step may be limited or inconsistent. Limited evidence may be established that **each** team member assumed responsibilities while implementing the plan. The feedback discussed may provide partial or inconsistent evidence that targeted encouragement was offered to team members, including the circumstances under which the targeted encouragement was offered and the reasons for offering it. There may be a limited description of a method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and the feedback's impact on the plan and the team members, and/or the method itself may be limited. Examination of the feedback's impact on the plan and the team's work may be partial, and/or the supporting examples may be loosely connected to the goal(s) of the plan. The discussion of the steps taken by the team to ensure that student learning was affected by the implementation of the plan may be vague or uneven. The process used by the team to collect the evidence of student learning may be limited, and/or the supporting examples taken from the student work may be loosely connected to measuring the impact on student learning. The response may only partially address the challenges that arose during the plan's implementation and/or may describe limited steps taken by the team to address the challenges. The steps taken by the team may be supported by vague examples or loosely connected to addressing the particular challenges that arose.

Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture

3.4.1. The response may provide evidence of only partially evaluating the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered. Supporting examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video may be incomplete. The evaluation of the extent to which team members experienced professional growth as partners in the collaborative team may be limited and/or supported with partial or loosely connected examples from the video. The response may describe limited or uneven steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement on the collaborative team, and/or the examples from the video used in support may be partial.

The steps taken to support self-reflection may be limited or inconsistent. The response may provide partial evidence of reflecting on how the feedback from team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams. The reflection may be supported by examples from the artifacts and/or video that are only loosely connected to thoughts about future collaborative work. The response may provide limited reflection on how the work of the collaborative team will serve as a means for positive change in the future, and/or it may only loosely connect specific aspects of the team's work to the impact it had on the school's culture.

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: selects an aspect of instruction or student learning that is trivial, presents a plan for development and/or implementation that is ineffective, provides little or no evidence of colleagues' involvement in the development and/or implementation of the plan, and/or contains little or no analysis and/or reflection. Responses at this score level may fail to respond completely to **all** parts of the guiding prompts, and their analysis 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, explanations, or examples, consider the evidence 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: Identifying the Collaborative Team

3.1.1. The response may provide minimal evidence that three to five appropriate colleagues with varying levels of experience and who could make significant contributions were selected to serve as team members; the rationales for their inclusion may be trivial or disconnected from the team's goals. The selected team members may have very similar backgrounds or be inappropriate for inclusion on the team. Steps taken to elicit and encourage **each** colleague's involvement with the team may be ineffective; evidence of encouragement for **each** colleague may be minimal or irrelevant, and/or the rationale may be inappropriate. The description of a structure put in place to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work may be minimal or absent, and/or its selection may be supported with an ineffective rationale.

Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.2.1. The response may provide little or no evidence of the appropriate selection of tool(s) used to collect data to identify a research-based instructional practice needing improvement. The data may be inaccurate, trivial, or inappropriate, and/or the response may provide minimal rationales for selecting the tool(s). The choice of tool(s) may be disconnected from the instructional practice being assessed, and/or the selection of the instructional need to target may be ineffectively supported by the data collected. The response may provide minimal rationales for choosing the identified area of practice. The tool(s) used to collect data to identify a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement may be inappropriate, and/or the description of the targeted area of need may be ineffective or inaccurate. The plan may be based on ineffective or inaccurate data analysis. There may be little or no evidence of steps taken to measure the intended impact and/or little or no effort to provide supporting rationales. The plan, goals, strategies,

9

timeline, and resources may be trivial or irrelevant, and/or the supporting rationales may be ineffective. The response may provide an inappropriate discussion of the colleagues who were targeted as the focus of the team's plan, and/or the reasons for selecting them may be minimal or irrelevant. There may be a minimal or inappropriate explanation of the expected impact that the plan for a collaborative team might have on improving the school culture.

3.2.2. The response may provide minimal evidence of the selection of appropriate strategies used with team members, **both individually and as a group**, to involve them in the planning process, and/or the use of the strategies may be supported with ineffective examples. The description of the strategies that were used to ensure that all team members were allowed a voice during the planning so that they could provide meaningful input related to the goals may be minimal or misinformed, and/or the strategies chosen may be supported with inappropriate examples. The response may provide little or no discussion of the challenges encountered during the planning and/or the team's resolution of those challenges, and/or the resolution itself may be ineffective. The choice of actions taken to resolve the challenges may be supported with a trivial or inappropriate rationale. There may be minimal evidence of informed steps taken to reach consensus among the team members while creating the plan, and/or there may be little or no effort to support the steps with examples.

Step 3: Implementing the Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

3.3.1. The response may describe incomplete or irrelevant steps the collaborative team took to implement the plan, and/or the supporting rationales for **each** step may be minimal. There may be little or no evidence that **each** team member assumed responsibilities while implementing the plan. The feedback discussed may provide minimal evidence that encouragement was offered to team members, including the circumstances under which the encouragement was offered and the reasons for offering it. There may be a trivial description of a method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and of the feedback's impact on the plan and the team members, and/or the method itself may be ineffective. Examination of the feedback's impact on the plan and the team's work may be trivial, and/or the supporting examples may be disconnected from the goal(s) of the team. The discussion of the steps taken by the team to ensure that student learning was being affected by the implementation of the plan may be incomplete or illogical. The process used by the team to collect the evidence of student learning may be inappropriate, and/or the supporting examples taken from the student work may be absent or disconnected from measuring the impact on student learning. The response may only minimally address the challenges that arose during the plan's implementation and/or may describe incomplete steps taken by the team to address the challenges. The steps taken by the team may be supported by trivial examples or disconnected from addressing the particular challenges that arose.

Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture

3.4.1. The response may provide evidence of a minimal or inappropriate evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered. Supporting examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video may be ineffective or absent. The evaluation of the extent to which team members experienced professional growth as partners in the collaborative team may be incomplete and/or supported with ineffective examples from the video. The response may describe ineffective or irrelevant steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement on the collaborative team, and/or the examples from the video used in support may be trivial or absent. The steps taken to support self-reflection may be incomplete or irrelevant. The response may provide inadequate reflection on how the feedback from team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams. The reflection may be supported by examples from the artifacts and/or the video that may be inappropriate or disconnected from thoughts about future collaborative work. The response may provide ineffective reflection on how the collaborative work will serve as a means for positive change in the school's culture in the future, and/or it may not connect specific aspects of the team's work to the impact it had on the school's culture.

Score Level 0

Step 1: Identifying the Collaborative Team

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 3—Step 1 textbox.

- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 3—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).

- The video artifact was edited (e.g., eliminating unwanted sections within segments, adding footage, adding audio-recorded material from another device, fade-ins, and/or fade-outs), resulting in every step receiving a 0.

- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 3 textboxes.
    - Representative page of the spreadsheet, table, or chart describing the team members

Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

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 any of the Task 3—Step 2 textboxes.

- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 3—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).
- The video artifact was edited (e.g., eliminating unwanted sections within segments, adding footage, adding audio-recorded material from another device, fade-ins, and/or fade-outs), resulting in every step receiving a 0.
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 3 textboxes.
    - Representative page from the data-collecting tool
    - Representative pages from the professional development plan
    - A five-minute segment on your work with colleagues during the planning discussed in textbox 3.2.2

Step 3: Implementing the Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture

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 3—Step 3 textbox.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 3—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).
- The video artifact was edited (e.g., eliminating unwanted sections within segments, adding footage, adding audio-recorded material from another device, fade-ins, and/or fade-outs), resulting in every step receiving a 0.
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 3 textboxes.
    - Representative page that provides feedback from the targeted audience of colleagues
    - Representative page of evidence that reflects student learning

- A five-minute segment on your work with colleagues during the implementation discussed in textbox 3.3.1

Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture

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 3—Step 4 textbox.

- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 3—Step 4.

- The written response is attached as a standalone document rather than directly in the textbox provided.

- The video artifact is missing.

- The video artifact is corrupt or will not play.

- The video artifact is inaudible.

- The video artifact was edited (e.g., eliminating unwanted sections within segments, adding footage, adding audio-recorded material from another device, fade-ins, and fade-outs), resulting in every step receiving a 0.

- The video does not meet the requirements for Task 3—Step 4 and is not acceptable.