

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 60

To see the passing score for your state or institution, go to the PASL assessment website at <http://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/school-leaders/scores/understand/>

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 at <http://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/school-leaders/scores/understand/>.

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

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.

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

1.00 out of 4

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

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

Step 2:

Researching and Developing a Plan

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 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 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

3.00 out of 4

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 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

4.00 out of 4

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

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

Total Score

10.00
out of 16

SAMPLE

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. Often, a response assigned a score of 1 results from the selection of a building-level professional development experience that does not impact instructional practice and student learning, that provides little or no evidence of colleagues' involvement, or that 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 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 that you could submit to support your choices. The preponderance of evidence in responses that receive a score of 1 exhibits the following characteristics.

The response may describe the inappropriate involvement of individuals in the development of the prioritized list, with weak reasons for their selection. There may be evidence of an ineffective 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 an ineffective use of appropriate data collected by the team to assist in prioritizing the list of significant professional development needs 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 weak or trivial. 2.1.1

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

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

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

Step 2:

Implementing 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

There may be evidence of cursory strategies and/or techniques chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, with an incomplete or vague rationale for the choices. The strategies/techniques may also be loosely connected. There may be evidence of a limited selection of appropriate individuals to participate in the professional development, with an incomplete rationale for these selections. There may be limited evidence of approaches used to facilitate the professional development, with a confusing rationale for the selected approaches; the identified approaches may be cursory. There may be evidence of loosely connected strategies used to actively engage the teachers, with an uneven rationale for the selected strategies. There may be limited evidence that the assignments given to participants and/or students affects instructional practice and student learning and cursory or confusing connection between the assignments and the professional development experience. 2.2.1

Step 3:

Analyzing Three Participants' Responses

The response provides logical evidence for the selection of three participants with different levels of experience, and there are appropriate rationales for the selected participants and how the professional development experience affected them. There is appropriate evidence of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of each participant, with relevant examples. There is a clear identification of the method of follow-up for each participant, and the rationale is relevant. There is clear evidence of the impact of each participant's professional development on student learning. The examples used to support the conclusions of the student work sample are aligned, but further examples from the student work may be needed to more clearly show the impact. 2.3.1

3.00 out of 4

Step 4:

Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

The response provides evidence of insightful 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 are consistent and substantive. There is excellent evidence that describes the modifications that could be made to the current professional development process, with an extensive rationale based on all aspects of the professional development experience. There is insightful evidence of the implications on all aspects of the experience and of how these implications support continuous professional development. There is a significant 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

4.00 out of 4

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

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

Total Score

10.00
out of 16

SAMPLE

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
----------------------------------	------------

Step 1:

Identifying the Collaborative Team

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 the selection of three to five colleagues with varying levels of experience to serve as team members. The rationale may be loosely connected to the choice of colleagues. There may be limited evidence of steps taken to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team; evidence of encouragement may be strong for some of the colleagues but not for all of them. The rationales for the steps may need more detail. The evidence of a structure put in place to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work may be limited. 3.1.1

2.00 out of 4

Step 2:

Developing a 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 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

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

2.00 out of 4

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

The response provides effective evidence of steps taken by the collaborative team to implement the plan. Evidence for rationales is supportive. There is clear evidence of the responsibility each team member assumed while implementing the plan. There is targeted evidence of the encouragement offered to team members, the circumstances under which the encouragement was offered, and the reasons for offering it. There is clear 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 are connected. There is appropriate evidence of steps taken by the team to ensure that student learning was affected by the implementation of the plan. There is appropriate 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 are clearly connected. The response provides solid evidence of challenges that arose during the implementation of the plan, with description of effective steps taken by the team to address the challenges. Examples to support the steps are sensible. 3.3.1

3.00 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.