Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)

Score Report Feedback

Task 1: Problem Solving in the Field

Score Level 1

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 1 results from the selection of a problem/challenge that does not impact instructional practice or student learning, provides little or no involvement by the candidate in the development and/or implementation of the plan, and/or has a missing or an ineffective reflection. Responses at this score level may fail to provide a complete response to **all** parts of the guiding prompts, and the quality of the responses 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 you could submit to support your choices. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 1 exhibits the following characteristics.

Step 1: Identifying a Problem/Challenge

The response may identify a problem/challenge with minimal evidence that the problem/challenge impacts instructional practice and student learning, or the issue may be one that focuses on perfunctory activities rather than instruction. Examples that demonstrate the impact may be inaccurate or missing. There may be little or no evidence of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of a problem/challenge, the data may not support the choice of problem/challenge, or the longitudinal data may be missing. The response may provide inappropriate evidence of identifying an anticipated result once the problem/challenge is addressed. There may be an irrelevant impact that the result will have on instructional practice and student learning. 1.1.1

Step 2: Researching and Developing a Plan

The response may provide evidence of research, if any was conducted, that is inappropriate or irrelevant to the development of the plan. The identification of school and/or district resources and their effect on the development of the plan may be trivial or missing. The response may provide little or no evidence of how the school/community/cultural influences affected the development of the plan. 1.2.1

There may minimal evidence of a developed plan or identified goals, and little or no timeline and steps are provided. The rationale for **each** step of the timeline may be

disjointed and need further clarification. There may be evidence of trivial reasons for selecting certain colleagues to help develop the plan and ineffective strategies used to communicate the plan to various audiences, with little or no rationales. Evidence of a method to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning may be ineffective. Identification of student work to reflect the impact on student learning may be misinformed. 1.2.2

Step 3: Implementing the Plan

The response may provide evidence of minimal actions taken to support implementation of the plan. The examples chosen may be ineffective. The evidence for why and how colleagues were chosen to include in the implementation may be missing or inappropriate. There may be evidence of ineffective communication strategies used with colleagues involved in the implementation. The reasons for using certain strategies and evidence of their impact on the implementation of the plan may be missing or trivial. 1.3.1

The response may provide evidence of illogical criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; reasons for their choice of criteria and methods may be missing. The evidence of adjustments made during the implementation may be missing or ineffective; if rationales are present, they may be unclear. There may be minimal evidence of how the implementation addressed the problem/challenge, with little or no examples. The response may provide little or no evidence of the effect of the plan on instructional practice and student learning. Work samples may be minimal or missing. 1.3.2

Step 4: Reflecting on the Plan and the Resolution

The response may provide evidence of irrelevant changes that the respondent would make on the development and/or implementation process. Examples supporting the conclusions may be ineffective or missing. There may be unclear or ineffective evidence of the influence of the development and implementation process on any future problem-solving tasks that may be approached, with inappropriate or missing examples. 1.4.1

Score Level 2

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. As you read through your submitted response, consider the quality and completeness of your response. Responses at this score level may provide an uneven or partial response to **all** parts of the guiding prompts. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.

Step 1: Identifying a Problem/Challenge

The response may provide evidence to support a cursory choice of a significant problem/challenge, but more detail may be needed to make the significance of the problem/challenge clear. There may be evidence that describes the impact the

problem/challenge has on student learning, but the evidence may be limited and loosely connected to the examples. There may be a limited use of longitudinal data to support the choice of a problem/challenge; a more complete and appropriate collection of longitudinal data may be needed. The response may provide partial or vague evidence of the anticipated result, but that result may need to be clearer or more closely connected to the significant problem/challenge. There may be some evidence that describes the impact that the anticipated result will have on instructional practice and student learning, but the description may be confusing or partial. 1.1.1

Step 2: Researching and Developing a Plan

The response may provide partial or vague evidence that research was identified and that it influenced the development of the plan; more appropriate research that clearly influences the development of the plan may make this response stronger. The response may provide evidence of an uneven identification of school and/or district resources and a limited explanation of their effect on the development of the plan; clearer examples about the resources and their use may be needed. The response may provide limited evidence of how the school/community/cultural influences affected the development of the plan; more appropriate details about all three areas may be needed. 1.2.1

There may be some uneven evidence of the developed plan and identified goals, but parts may be limited with a vague timeline and steps; the rationales may need to be more closely connected to the choice of timeline and steps. There may be partial or vague evidence of the reasons for the selection of certain colleagues to help develop the plan and a cursory discussion of their roles; more relevant evidence may be needed. There may be some evidence of cursory strategies used to communicate the plan to various audiences, but the strategies may be only partially described. Evidence of a method to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning may be limited. Identification of student work to reflect the impact on student learning may be partial or tangential. 1.2.2

Step 3: Implementing the Plan

The response may provide some evidence of actions taken to support implementation of the plan, but the evidence may be limited. The examples provided may be loosely connected and need to better facilitate instructional improvements. The evidence for why and how colleagues were chosen to be included in the implementation may be partial. More evidence may be needed to show how the colleagues were included. There may be evidence of partial or loosely connected communication strategies used with the colleagues involved in the implementation. The rationales for the strategies and their impact on the implementation of the plan may need to be more clear and aligned. 1.3.1

The response may provide some evidence of the criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; reasons for their choice may be limited or partial. The response may provide limited evidence of adjustments made during the

implementation. There may be partial evidence of how the implementation addressed the problem/challenge. The response may provide partial evidence of the effect of the plan on instructional practice and student learning. The work samples may be loosely connected. 1.3.2

Step 4: Reflecting on the Plan and the Resolution

The response may provide evidence of limited changes to be made in the implementation process, with loose connections to the examples cited. There may be evidence of the influence that the development and implementation process has on any future problem-solving tasks, but the evidence is partial with limited examples; the connections between what was learned and how it will influence future actions may be cursory or limited. 1.4.1

Score Level 3

Step 1: Identifying a Problem/Challenge

The response provides effective evidence to support the choice of a significant problem/challenge, but to make this an even stronger response, more details or insights explaining the significance of the issue may be needed. There is appropriate evidence of the impact the problem/challenge has on student learning, but a more detailed description may be needed. There is evidence of appropriate use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of a problem/challenge. The response provides relevant evidence of identifying an anticipated result, but to make this an even stronger response, the result may need to be more substantive. There is appropriate evidence of the impact that the addressed result will have on instructional practice and student learning. 1.1.1

Step 2: Researching and Developing a Plan

The response provides appropriate evidence of research conducted and how that research influenced the development of the plan; the inclusion of more significant research might make this response even stronger. The response provides effective evidence of identifying school and/or district resources and an explanation of their effect on developing the plan; extensive influence of the resources on the development of the plan may be needed. The response provides appropriate evidence of school/community/cultural influences that affected the development of the plan. 1.2.1

There is evidence of an effective plan, identified goals, an appropriate timeline, and steps; the rationales may need to be more tightly connected to the choice of timeline and steps. There is evidence of relevant reasons for the selection of specific colleagues to help develop the plan and discussion of their roles, but more a more thorough identification may be needed. There is evidence of relevant strategies used to communicate the plan to various audiences, but the strategies may need a more insightful description. Evidence of a method to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning is effective. Student work that accurately reflects the impact on student learning is identified, but the rationale may need further detail. 1.2.2

Step 3: Implementing the Plan

The response provides evidence of informed actions taken to support implementation of the plan; the examples used are clearly connected to the actions. The evidence for why and how colleagues were chosen to be included in the implementation is appropriate and informed. More insightful evidence may be needed to show how the colleagues were included. There is evidence of effective communication strategies used with colleagues involved in the implementation. The reasons for the strategies and their impact on the implementation of the plan may need further detail to make this an even stronger response. 1.3.1

The response provides evidence of a relevant choice of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; reasons for their choice are appropriate. The response provides evidence of logical adjustments made during the implementation. There is evidence of how the implementation appropriately addressed the problem/challenge. The response provides relevant evidence of how the plan impacted instructional practice and student learning. The work samples appropriately connect to support for the analysis. 1.3.2

Step 4: Reflecting on the Plan and the Resolution

The response provides evidence of effective changes that can be made in the implementation process, and relevant examples are cited. There is evidence of relevant reflection on lessons learned from the entire process of developing and implementing the plan, with appropriate examples. The influence of the development and implementation process on any future problem-solving tasks is informed, with appropriate examples provided; more insightful and significant reflections may be needed to make this an even stronger response. 1.4.1

Score Level 4

Step 1: Identifying a Problem/Challenge

The response provides insightful and well-defined evidence to support the choice of a significant problem/challenge. There is substantive evidence of the impact the problem/challenge has on student learning. There is evidence of extensive use of longitudinal data to support the choice of the problem/challenge. The response provides insightful and detailed evidence of the anticipated result. There is an extensive description of the impact that the anticipated result will have on instructional practice and student learning. 1.1.1

Step 2: Researching and Developing a Plan

The response provides significant evidence of research conducted and how that research insightfully influenced the development of the plan. The response provides extensive evidence of school and/or district resources and a detailed explanation of their effect on

the development of the plan. The response provides excellent evidence that school/community/cultural influences significantly affected the development of the plan. 1.2.1

There is extensive evidence of a developed plan, goals, a substantive timeline, and steps, with insightful rationales. There are tightly connected reasons for the selection of colleagues to help develop the plan and a detailed description of their roles. There is evidence of in-depth strategies used to communicate the plan to various audiences and tightly connected rationales for their choice. Evidence of a well-defined method to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning is present, with extensive rationales for the choice of student work provided. 1.2.2

Step 3: Implementing the Plan

The response provides evidence of detailed actions taken to support implementation of the plan; the examples used are thoroughly connected to the actions. The evidence for why and how colleagues were chosen to be included in the implementation is insightful and in-depth. There is evidence of substantive communication strategies used with colleagues involved in the implementation. The reasons for the selection of the strategies and a description of their impact on the implementation of the plan are thorough and detailed. 1.3.1

The response provides evidence of well-defined criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; reasons for the choice are very detailed. The response provides evidence of insightful adjustments made during the implementation. There is thorough evidence of how the implementation addresses the problem/challenge. The response provides substantive evidence of the impact of the plan on instructional practice and student learning. The work samples provide extensive support for the analysis. 1.3.2

Step 4: Reflecting on the Plan and the Resolution

The response provides evidence of substantive changes to be made in the implementation process, with excellent examples. There is evidence of an extensive reflection on the entire process of developing and implementing the plan, with insightful examples. There are significant and insightful examples cited of how the knowledge gained will influence future approaches to problem-solving tasks. 1.4.1