

John Smith
 1 Main Street
 City, TX 12345

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
 Submission Window: Spring 2020
 Report Date: July 29, 2020
 Educator Preparation Program: AAAA (1234)

ETS ID#: 1234567891

Your Score Summary

| Task | Date Submitted | Your Score |
|--------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Task 1 | May 11, 2020 | 8.33 out of 12 |
| Task 2 | May 11, 2020 | 8.50 out of 12 |
| Task 3 | May 11, 2020 | 6.00 out of 12 |
| Task 4 | May 11, 2020 | 7.50 out of 12 |
| Task 5 | May 11, 2020 | 6.00 out of 12 |
| Task 6 | May 11, 2020 | 5.67 out of 12 |

Cumulative Score for All 6 Tasks

Total Score **42** out of 72

For more information about scores and state passing requirements, see the "Understanding Your Scores" page of the PATL assessment website at <https://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/teacher-leaders/scores/understand/>.

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

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 about the rubrics and the score points for this assessment, see the “Understanding Your Scores” page of the PATL assessment website at <https://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/teacher-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: May 11, 2020

| Adult Learning and the Collaborative Culture | | Your Score |
|---|---|----------------------|
| <p>Step 1: <i>Your Colleagues' Learning Needs and the Task/Project</i></p> | <p>The response shows effective evidence of the facilitation of the colleagues in determining a task, and the response also contains an adequate explanation of the significance of the chosen task. The plan of action to promote learning is detailed, effective, and clearly tied to the task. 1.1.1</p> <p>There is effective evidence of how the teacher leader facilitated the selection of a significant task with the colleagues, but a description of additional interaction among the colleagues in choosing the task may make the response stronger. The response provides evidence to show the significance of the task. There is solid evidence of a plan to promote learning, and the plan is clear and effectively connected to the desired learning. Connection of the required artifact to the response is appropriate. 1.1.2</p> | 3.33 out of 4 |
| <p>Step 2: <i>Adult Learning-Individuals and the Group</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may contain some description and rationale of the adult-learning strategies used with each learner to help support collaboration, solve problems, and manage conflict, but more appropriate strategies could have been chosen, and more detail may be needed to show the connection between the strategies and the individuals. There may be some discussion of differentiation and some scaffolding of the learning strategies, but the evidence may not provide a sufficient explanation of both. The required artifact for this textbox response provides a global connection. 1.2.1</p> <p>The response may contain some description of the adult-learning strategies used with the group as a whole, but more evidence may be needed to show the connections between the strategies and the group. Although there may be some evidence of adult-learning strategies as they are applied in specific interactions, the response may need more evidence as to why and how the interactions were significant. 1.2.2</p> | 2.67 out of 4 |

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

| Adult Learning and the Collaborative Culture | | Your Score |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 3: <i>Impact of Adult Learning</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>Although the response may contain evidence of the impact of applying the adult-learning strategies to the individuals, the impact may need to be more tightly connected to the individuals, and the evidence may need to evaluate the impact in more detail. The response may contain some evidence of the creation of an environment of trust and a sense of ownership among colleagues. The response may provide some evidence of the impact that the teacher leader’s work with colleagues had on student learning, but further detail for all responses is needed. Connection of the required artifact to the response may be unclear or superficial. 1.3.1</p> | <p>2.33 out of 4</p> |

Total Score

8.33
out of 12

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

Task 2

Submitted: May 11, 2020

| Research for the Improvement of Practice | | Your Score |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 1: <i>The Research Process</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited and/or cursory 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics</p> <p>The response may contain limited evidence of the steps taken to initiate the action-research process. The detail in the steps to initiate the process may be brief or superficial. More evidence of guiding colleagues to identify and select an action-research issue may be needed. The response may provide evidence of guiding colleagues in the process of accessing and using research, but more detail may be needed. The response may contain some discussion of facilitating analysis and decision making with colleagues and may need more discussion of the group, of individuals, or both. There may be some evidence of guiding colleagues to collaborate with educational organization(s) that have researched related issues, but more detail focusing on the actual collaboration is needed. 2.1.1</p> | <p>2.50 out of 4</p> |
| <p>Step 2: <i>Data Analysis and Application</i></p> | <p>The response provides substantive evidence facilitating colleagues' analysis of the curriculum-based data produced by the action research. There is worthwhile evidence of facilitating colleagues' application of the data findings and significant evidence of connections of the resulting data to student learning. The connection of this response to the data artifact is perceptive. 2.2.1</p> | <p>4.00 out of 4</p> |
| <p>Step 3: <i>Student Learning and Professional Practice</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited and/or cursory 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may provide limited evidence of the effect of the curriculum-based research process on student learning. There may be partial evidence of the effect of the research process on colleagues' ability to select strategies that support student learning and improve professional practice. There may be tangential evidence that the impact of the research process on student learning is ongoing, but a clearer explanation is needed. The connection of the artifact to the response is perfunctory and may need more detail. 2.3.1</p> | <p>2.00 out of 4</p> |

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

Total Score

8.50
out of 12

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

Task 3

Submitted: May 11, 2020

| Professional Learning | Your Score |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 1: <i>Professional Learning Plan</i></p> <p>The response contains solid evidence of the creation of a professional learning plan that evolved from a needs assessment AND involves colleagues and school administrators in the design. The connection of the plan to the needs assessment is evident, but more detail may be needed in describing the involvement of BOTH colleagues and administrators. The response contains solid evidence of a goal that is aligned with school/district goals. The rationale for the significance of the goal and how it is connected to the alignment with school/district goals is substantive. The response could be strengthened by adding more detail regarding the alignment to both school and district goals or by describing the rationale's significance and connection to the goals. The response contains solid evidence of the identification of the components of the professional learning plan and the components' connection to the teachers' needs and student learning. The evidence in this response demonstrates a clear connection of this plan to student learning and teacher needs. Evidence may need to be strengthened for one of these components by adding more detail. Demonstration of how the plan is embedded within the school/district culture is sensible but may be stronger for one rather than both. The connection of the attached artifact to the response for this textbox is relevant. 3.1.1</p> | <p>3.00 out of 4</p> |
| <p>Step 2: <i>Implementation of the Professional Learning Plan</i></p> <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may contain limited evidence of the teacher leader's role in facilitating the implementation of the professional learning plan. The response may be overly broad in the demonstration of how the plan fosters coherent, integrated, and differentiated professional learning. This response may provide limited evidence of the use of appropriate resources to meet the professional learning goals and limited evidence of how the teacher leader facilitated the meaningful use of technology and/or a media literacy in the plan. The evidence of the connection of the plan with the resources selected may be sketchy or contain a loosely connected rationale for the use of the technology or media literacy. The response contains limited evidence of feedback provided to colleagues to support them in their professional development. Evidence of the impact of the professional learning plan on students and teachers may be only be partially engaging. There is some inclusion of the data for this plan and how the data were collaboratively collected, analyzed, and used with colleagues to support the evaluation. The connection of the attached artifact to the response for this textbox may be confusing. 3.2.1</p> | <p>2.00 out of 4</p> |

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

| Professional Learning | | Your Score |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 3: <i>Evaluation of the Professional Learning Plan</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 1 provides little or no analysis and/or 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.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 1 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>This response contains little or no evidence of the impact of the feedback received from students, teachers, and/or administrators. Demonstration of how this feedback will inform and facilitate the design and implementation of future professional development may also be missing. There may be incomplete evidence, or the connections are not evident or disjointed. This response contains little or no evidence of advocacy for supports to promote sustained professional learning. Evidence may be simplistic and may not show a connection or support a rationale. The connection of the attached artifact to the response for this textbox may be missing or ineffective. 3.3.1</p> | <p>1.00 out of 4</p> |

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Total Score | 6.00 out of 12 |
|--------------------|--------------------------|

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

Task 4

Submitted: May 11, 2020

| Observation and Use of Assessment Data | Your Score |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 1: <i>Pre-observation</i></p> <p>The response may provide strong evidence of steps taken by the teacher leader to work with a colleague. There is clear evidence of the help provided to the colleague to collect, analyze, and apply data to inform the focus of the lesson. The response may provide some discussion of support provided to the colleague regarding the selection and inclusion of multiple assessments, but the discussion of multiple assessments, other data-collecting tools, and alignment with goals and standards may require even further detail. There may be evidence of feedback provided at the pre-observation session concerning the colleague’s lesson design, but the evidence still may need further detail. There may be evidence that the teacher leader modeled reflective practice strategies for the colleague, but the evidence may need more explanation. The connection of the required artifact to this textbox is appropriate. 4.1.1</p> | <p>3.00 out of 4</p> |
| <p>Step 2: <i>Observation and Feedback</i></p> <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may provide evidence of a focus on appropriate goals and instruction during the observation, but the rationale may not be clearly detailed, and/or the choice of goals and instruction may need to be more appropriate. There may be some evidence of an analysis of the effectiveness of the assessment and other data-collecting tools, but the analysis may be lacking detail. There may be limited evidence of the connection between the feedback from the pre-observation conference and its impact on the lesson. There may be incomplete detail supporting any suggested revisions that could be made to the pre-observation conference after observing the lesson. 4.2.1</p> <p>The response may provide some evidence of feedback and strategies modeled to support and enhance the colleague’s reflective skills. The evidence of feedback offered the colleague in evaluating the use of multiple assessment tools to make informed decisions for improving instructional practice and student learning may be partial; the reference to a particular occurrence that warranted the feedback may be limited. 4.2.2</p> | <p>2.50 out of 4</p> |

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

| Observation and Use of Assessment Data | Your Score |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 3: Overall Analysis and Reflection</p> <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>There may be some evidence of how the colleague's response to feedback will affect the teacher leader's ability to advance the professional skills of other colleagues in the future. The response may provide limited evidence of how to promote improvement in other colleagues' instructional practice in the future through the collection of assessment and data results. The connection of the required artifact to this textbox response may be uneven. 4.3.1</p> | <p>2.00 out of 4</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>Total Score</p> | <p>7.50 out of 12</p> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

Task 5

Submitted: May 11, 2020

| Collaboration with Families and the Community | | Your Score |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 1: <i>The Needs Assessment</i></p> | <p>The response may contain effective evidence of facilitation and collaboration in the development of a family and community needs assessment. Evidence of the connection between the needs assessment results and the identification of how the targeted area of need will improve a relevant aspect of the educational system and enhance student learning is solid. The response provides solid evidence of how the collaborative development of the needs assessment helped identify opportunities to improve colleagues' collaboration, communication, and understanding of family and community in order to improve student learning. Clear detail referencing the improvement of student learning is addressed. Connection of the required artifact to the response is appropriate. 5.1.1</p> | <p>3.00 out of 4</p> |
| <p>Step 2: <i>Development and Implementation of the Plan</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 1 provides little or no analysis and/or 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.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 1 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may contain little evidence of the understanding of the various backgrounds, ethnicities, and cultures within the school and community to influence colleagues' development and implementation of the plan. Evidence of leadership is needed, or details in connecting the understanding of the backgrounds, ethnicities, and cultures to the development and implementation of the plan may be trivial or unclear. Evidence of facilitating the development and implementation of the plan by using the specific adult-learning strategies used with colleagues may be missing. More details regarding the facilitation skills used with colleagues are needed to strengthen this response. 5.2.1</p> | <p>1.00 out of 4</p> |

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

| Collaboration with Families and the Community | | Your Score |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 3: Overall Analysis and Reflection</p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may contain limited evidence of the successes and challenges encountered with colleagues, including how the teacher leader's work improved colleagues' understanding of the needs of the educational system and of students during the planning and implementation process. There may be limited evidence of improvement of colleagues' the understanding of the strategies for collaboration and communication with families and the community. 5.3.1</p> <p>The response may contain limited evidence of how the impact of feedback received from colleagues and how an analysis of that feedback will affect the teacher leader's future facilitation of colleagues' collaboration with families and the community to improve the educational system and student learning. Connection of the required artifact to the response may be limited. 5.3.2</p> | <p>2.00 out of 4</p> |

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Total Score | 6.00 out of 12 |
|--------------------|--------------------------|

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

Task 6

Submitted: May 11, 2020

| Collaborative Teams and Advocacy | | Your Score |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Step 1: <i>The Advocacy Plan and Your Team Members</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may contain a tangential connection of the advocacy plan to the needs assessment or offers inconsistent evidence of how the plan is relevant to the needs of the educational system. The response may be routine or loosely connected in describing a link to the improvement of student learning. The response may lack evidence of how educational policies and trends influenced the teacher leader's work with colleagues in developing and implementing the plan. The connection of the required artifact to the response may be limited. 6.1.1</p> <p>The response may contain a description of the colleagues who were part of the collaborative team, but the rationale for the choice of each member or the evidence of how the teacher leader facilitated the team members' contributions to the plan is overly broad. The response may need more detail to address the strategies and leadership skills used to build a collaborative team and how those strategies and skills connect to each of the team members. Evidence of the ways the teacher leader promoted and supported collegial interactions may be limited. Evidence of how the teacher leader promoted the team members' understanding of the effect that educational policy has on the advocacy plan may be lacking in detail. The response may provide limited evidence of steps taken by the teacher leader to ensure that professional resources were available to the colleagues as they worked on the plan. 6.1.2</p> | <p>2.00 out of 4</p> |
| <p>Step 2: <i>Advocacy for Educational Improvement</i></p> | <p>There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 2 provides limited analysis and/or 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 partial or vague.</p> <p>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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 2 exhibits the following characteristics.</p> <p>The response may lack detail in determining the procedures to implement as part of the advocacy plan and/or in connecting these procedures tightly to the plan. Evidence of activities undertaken to involve stakeholders and to advocate effectively within and beyond the school community to have an impact on the educational system and to improve student learning may be overly broad. 6.2.1</p> | <p>2.00 out of 4</p> |

John Smith
ETS ID#: 1234567891

ETS® Performance Assessment for Teacher Leaders
Report Date: July 29, 2020

| Collaborative Teams and Advocacy | Your Score |
|----------------------------------|------------|
|----------------------------------|------------|

Step 3:

Evaluation of the Plan and Professional Growth

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective. Often, a response assigned a score of 1 provides little or no analysis and/or 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, consider the evidence you could submit to support your choices and/or decisions. The preponderance of evidence present in responses that receive a score of 1 exhibits the following characteristics.

The response may fail to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan and professional growth of the team. The response may provide little or no evidence of an analysis of the effectiveness of the advocacy plan on collaboration with the team in enhancing both professional practice and student learning. The response may provide little or no evidence of how feedback received from stakeholders affected implementation or outcome of the plan. The response may provide little or no analysis of how your work with collaborative teams has affected both colleagues' collegial interactions and their professional practice. Analysis of both interactions needs to be addressed. The response may provide little or no evidence of the impact of the advocacy plan on future advocacy within the school and district. The connection of the required artifact to the response may be trivial or missing.
6.3.1

1.67 out of 4

Total Score

5.67
out of 12