

John Smith
1 Main Street
City, MO 12345

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Submission Window: Spring 2018
Report Date: May 16, 2018
Educator Preparation Program: AAAA (1234)

ETS ID#: 1234567891

Your Score Summary

Task	Date Submitted	Your Score
Task 1	April 08, 2018	10.00 out of 16
Task 2	April 08, 2018	10.00 out of 16
Task 3	April 08, 2018	22.00 out of 32

Cumulative Score for All 3 Tasks

Total Score

42 out of 64

For more information about scores and state passing requirements, see the "Understanding Your Scores" page of the [PASL assessment website](#).

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Report Date: May 16, 2018

Detailed Feedback on Your Scores

The score range for each step is 1–4, with 4 being the highest. A “0” means that the evidence was either missing or did not address the rubric.

For more information, or to see feedback for all score points for this assessment, see the “Understanding Your Scores” page of the [PASL assessment website](#).

ETS reserves the right to cancel scores at any time when, in its judgment, there is an apparent discrepancy in a test-taker’s identification, there is evidence that text submitted is substantially similar to that found in other performance assessment responses, or the score is invalid for another reason.

Task 1

Submitted: April 08, 2018

Problem Solving in the Field

Your Score

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

4.00 out of 4

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

4.00 out of 4

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

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Report Date: May 16, 2018

Step 3:
Implementing the Plan

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.

1.00 out of 4

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.

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

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.

1.00 out of 4

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.

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

Total Score

10.00
out of 16

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Report Date: May 16, 2018

Task 2

Submitted: April 08, 2018

Supporting Continuous Professional Development

Your Score

Step 1:

Designing Building-level Professional Development

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.

2.00 out of 4

The response may describe the limited involvement of individuals in the development of the prioritized list, with partial reasons for their selection. There may be evidence of a limited process used by the team to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goals. There may be a cursory use of appropriate data collected by the team to assist in prioritizing the list of significant professional development needs, and the data are aligned with building, district, and/or state goals. The connection between prioritized needs, the building or district goals, and/or the state goals may be partial or vague. 2.1.1

The response may provide evidence of a loosely connected selection of a need chosen from the prioritized list, with a partial or vague rationale for the selection. There may be a partial development of goals for the professional development plan and a vague plan for determining whether the goal or goals are achieved. There may also be limited evidence of the professional development plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning. The response may identify limited research to support the professional development, and it may have an uneven connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. There may be partial evidence of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development. The response may provide limited evidence of the individuals' involvement in the creation of the professional development plan and include a partial or vague rationale for choosing these individuals. There may be cursory or partial evidence in the response of follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, and the rationale for the follow-up may be vague or limited. 2.1.2

Step 2:

Implementing Building-level Professional Development

The response provides thorough evidence of strategies and/or techniques that were chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, with an in-depth rationale for the choices. There is significant evidence that describes the selection of appropriate individuals to participate in the professional development, with a detailed rationale for these selections. There is thorough evidence of approaches used to facilitate the professional development, with an in-depth rationale for the selected approaches. There is evidence of excellent strategies used to actively engage the teachers, with a detailed rationale for the selected strategies. There is extensive evidence that the assignments given to participants and/or students affects instructional practice and student learning, and there is a significant connection between the assignments and the professional development experience. 2.2.1

4.00 out of 4

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Report Date: May 16, 2018

Step 3:

Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

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.

2.00 out of 4

The response may provide incomplete evidence for the selection of three participants with different levels of experience, and there may be limited or vague rationales for the selected participants and how the professional development experience affected them. There may be uneven evidence of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of each participant, with fair or confusing examples. There may be a limited or vague identification of the method of follow-up for each participant, and the rationale may be partial or cursory. There may be limited evidence of the impact of each participant's professional development on student learning, and the examples used to support the conclusions of the student work sample may be cursory or partial. 2.3.1

Step 4:

Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

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.

2.00 out of 4

The response may provide limited or uneven evidence of any conclusions drawn 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, or there is an inconsistent or partial analysis of the feedback. There may be partial or vague evidence of the modifications that could be made to the current professional development process. The rationale may include a confusing or cursory analysis of all the aspects of the professional development experience. There may be partial evidence of the implications on all aspects of the experience and of how these implications support continuous professional development. There may be a loosely connected or partial 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. 2.4.1

Total Score

10.00
out of 16

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Report Date: May 16, 2018

Task 3

Submitted: April 08, 2018

Creating a Collaborative Culture		Your Score
<p>Step 1: <i>Identifying the Collaborative Team</i></p>	<p>The response provides effective evidence of the selection of three to five colleagues with varying levels of experience to serve as team members. The rationale is clearly connected to the choice of colleagues. There is solid evidence of steps taken to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team; further evidence of encouragement with some of the colleagues may be needed. The rationales for the steps are connected. The evidence of a structure put in place to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work is targeted. 3.1.1</p>	<p>3.00 out of 4</p>
<p>Step 2: <i>Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture</i></p>	<p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Responses that receive a score of 2 also may exhibit one or more of the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may provide uneven evidence of the tool(s) used to collect data to identify research-based instructional practice in need of improvement. The response may provide limited rationales for the selection of the tool(s). The data may be lacking detail. The identified area may have limited research-based support, and there may be partial evidence of an identified impact of improvement on student learning. More detail may be needed to describe steps taken to measure the intended impact, and the rationales may be partial. There may be some connection between the developed plan and the data that were collected and analyzed. The response may provide partial evidence of the use of goals, steps, a timeline, and resources that are parts of the plan. Rationales may be lacking detail. The choice of colleagues targeted as the focus of the team's plan may not be well explained. Reasons for the selection of the targeted colleagues may be incomplete. There may be partial evidence of the planning for the collaborative team's improvement of the school culture. 3.2.1</p> <p>The response may provide limited evidence of the discussion strategies implemented with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process. Examples to support the choice of strategies may be uneven. There may be tangential strategies that were implemented to ensure that all team members were allowed a voice during the planning so they could provide meaningful input related to the goals. The response may provide partial evidence of challenges encountered during the planning and team resolution of those challenges. The rationales for the choice of actions to resolve the challenges may be incomplete. There may be limited evidence of steps taken to reach consensus among the members of the team while creating the plan. Examples to support the steps may be limited. 3.2.2</p>	<p>2.00 out of 4</p>

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for School Leaders
Report Date: May 16, 2018

Step 3:

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

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Responses that receive a score of 2 also may exhibit one or more of the following characteristics.

The response may provide uneven evidence of steps taken by the collaborative team to implement the plan. Evidence for rationales may be minimal. There may be limited evidence of the responsibility each team member assumed while implementing the plan. There may be partial evidence of the encouragement offered to team members, the circumstances under which the encouragement was offered, and the reasons for offering it. There may be limited evidence of feedback elicited by the team from the targeted audience and the feedback's impact on the plan and the team members. Supporting examples may be loosely connected. There may be some evidence of steps taken by the team to ensure that student learning was being affected by the implementation of the plan, but more detail may be needed. There may be limited evidence of a process used by the team to collect the evidence of student learning; examples from the student work that support the effect of the process may be confusing. The response may provide partial evidence of challenges that arose during the implementation of the plan, with uneven steps taken by the team to address the challenges. Examples to support the steps may be limited. 3.3.1

2.00 out of 4

Step 4:

Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture

The response provides thorough evidence of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered. Examples from the plan, from the artifacts, and/or from the video are in-depth. There is significant evidence of the professional growth of team members as partners in the collaborative team. There is rich evidence of the evaluation of team members' growth and contributions. The response provides strong evidence of steps taken before and during conversations to encourage discussion about team members' self-reflection related to their involvement in the collaborative team. Examples from the video provide extensive evidence of efforts to support self-reflection. There is thorough evidence of the influence of team members' feedback on future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams. The evidence that the collaborative team will serve as a vehicle for positive change in the future is thorough. The evidence consistently connects specific work with specific impact on school culture. Examples from the artifacts and/or the video are detailed and insightfully linked. 3.4.1

4.00 out of 4

Total Score

22.00
out of 32
(Weight x 2)

Task 3 focuses on the candidate's efforts to create a collaborative culture. Because a major artifact is a fifteen minute video of the candidate's performance, the final score for this task is double-weighted.