



Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL) Library of Examples – Task 2

PASL Task 2, Step 1, Textbox 2.1.1

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.1.1 as excerpted from the portfolios of two different candidates. The candidate responses were not corrected or changed from what was submitted. One response was scored at the Met/Exceeded Standards Level, and the other response was scored at the Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level. This information is being provided for illustrative purposes only. These excerpts are not templates for candidates to use to guarantee a successful score. Rather, they are examples that candidates can use for comparison purposes to see the kinds of evidence that they may need to add to their own work.

The work you submit as part of your response to each task must be yours and yours alone. Your written commentaries, the student work and other artifacts you submit, and your video recordings must all feature teaching that you did and work that you supervised.

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

Textbox 2.1.1: The Prioritized List

Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. The individuals that were involved in developing the prioritized list included the special education professional development committee. On this team is a Special Education Program Coordinator, a Special Education Instructional Coach, a Special Education Teacher, and a Regular Education Teacher. These individuals were selected to get the perspective of each level of planning and support that will need to take place to move special education services from the special education setting to the regular education setting. The program coordinator is the big picture member who has the knowledge of what direction and standards need to be met. The instructional coach has the perspective of what is needed district wide regarding special education instruction. The special education teacher can share what is working and what is not working in trying to move forward. The regular education teacher is able to hear the ideas of moving instruction into the regular education setting and can share what may work or not work. Together as a team everyone brings different perspectives that are needed in order to determine the professional development that is necessary to help special education have the support to move special education instruction to the regular education setting.

b. The process that was used to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs that are aligned to the district and building goals was done through gathering information and data from multiple sources. The special education professional development committee first reviewed data points from the district's State Performance Plan (SPP)-Special education section. After analyzing and reviewing the data we determined that overall, the district does a great job meeting the expectations. However, one area that the district is not meeting is the placement of the percent of students receiving special education served within the regular education setting. We decided, after reviewing the SPP report, to take a closer look and review the data for students with IEPs. Two school's special education student data was pulled to look at how we are doing regarding progress and moving students to a less restrictive environment. We compared each student's IEP from one year to the next IEP year cycle to determine what progress was made in regard to generalizing skills and closing the gap. The first school that was pulled had around 20 students. We learned that only one student decreased the number of minutes in an intervention or in a different location. The second school's

data of IEP minutes of about 30 students showed 28 of all students' minutes stayed the same with no location change and only two students' minutes increased. The data collected of these 50 students indicated that the delivery of interventions that are being given is not moving students to a less restrictive environment. The team determined that special education teachers needed to be served to determine what barriers they are having about moving students to the least restrictive environment. From the survey results the team grouped similar barriers and determined which were the most significant and frequent that were not allowing special education teachers to generalize skills being taught to the regular education setting.

c. The data sources that we collected to prioritize the list of significant professional development needs that are aligned to our district's and schools' goals includes the district's state performance plan, student IEP service summaries, and a teachers' needs survey. In the 2016-2017 State Performance Plan report from DESE it indicates that the district is performing below expectation in the category of servicing students inside regular education >79%. We achieved a 48% and the state performance target is 56%. We then collected student data from two schools to determine the effect of moving students into the least restrictive environment. Our committee also created the teacher needs.

d. The prioritized needs for professional development addresses the goals of the building and district which aligns to the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). The district has a CSIP goal of using data, identifying model lessons that are rigorous, research based effective strategies, high student engagement, and differentiate instruction for students to reach full potential. The team took the State Performance Plan (SPP) as the jumping off point to determine the prioritized list of professional development. The district uses the data from the SPP report to create the district CSIP goals. Therefore, the prioritized list of professional development needed to increase special education services delivered within the regular education setting, is aligned to the district CSIP goal of helping students reach full potential.

Refer to the Task 2 Rubric for Textbox 2.1.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of implementing building-level professional development, where is there evidence of the following?

- A rationale for the individuals selected to develop the prioritized list of the professional development needs of the building-level teachers
- The process used, by the team, to develop a prioritized list of professional development needs of the building-level teachers and how the needs are aligned to the building/district and/or state goals
- A rationale for the data collected by the team to prioritize the needs and how the needs are aligned to the building/district and/or state goals
- A rationale for how the prioritized needs address the goals of the building/district and/or state
- Why is the candidate's response appropriate and detailed?

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

Textbox 2.1.1: The Prioritized List

Did not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. Both our building level and assistant principal were involved in developing the plan for our professional development days. Additionally, two team leaders from each grade were involved in helping set up the design of how our professional development days would be ran based on the needs of the building and periods

allotted for professional development. These individuals were selected because they are considered as leaders of our school. Ultimately, all professional development needs are addressed based on the ideas/plans of the building principals. Team leaders also have an input and are considered to have valuable feedback and information for the administrators.

b. Our school district prepares for professional development in a way that is individualized for each building. There is not a specific prioritized list of professional development needs created for the district or even the buildings. Each of the building principals are able to plan and provide the professional development needs specific to their building. If there is a district-wide area of concern, the superintendents would notify the principal of that concern and let him/her know when that concern would be addressed during professional development. For example, last year we had a district-wide intruder training. The entire district met during a professional development day for an hour to get an overview of our training and then each of the four buildings had separate 2-hour training sessions in their respective buildings. Each building principal had to coordinate and plan the remainder of the professional development training day(s) around the intruder training.

c. Specifically for the building I work in, the principals look at the previous year's Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) results and our Standardized Testing and Results (STAR) data to see what areas need improvement. Our principal then looks at the building needs that the teachers expressed as their concerns. At the end of the year there is a survey on professional development and teachers can express new areas they want addressed as well as areas they don't like about previous professional development days. Based on last year's survey results and the academic results, our building principal decided this year we would have mini sessions on the basics. According to our MAP data, the building dropped in different areas. The drop was not too significant, but enough to raise a concern about the basics of teaching throughout the building. Our principal then created five different twenty-minute sessions for each of our four professional development days. The sessions are based on what needs we need from our MAP data and the areas our teachers would like more help/knowledge with.

d. Since we do not have a prioritized list of professional development needs, I looked at the plans that my principal put in place for this school year's professional development days. Each professional development day meets either the building goals or the district goals of improving student learning. Our principal creates the CSIP (comprehensive school improvement plan) based on our MAP and STAR results which is also used to create the needs for our professional development days. Since the results are used for both, they go hand in hand on making sure our improvements are being met during professional development.

Refer to the Task 2 Rubric for Textbox 2.1.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of implementing building-level professional development, where is there evidence of the following?

- A rationale for the individuals selected to develop the prioritized list of the professional development needs of the building-level teachers
- The process used, by the team, to develop a prioritized list of professional development needs of the building-level teachers and how the needs are aligned to the building/district and/or state goals
- A rationale for the data collected by the team to prioritize the needs and how the needs are aligned to the building/district and/or state goals
- A rationale for how the prioritized needs address the goals of the building/district and/or state

- Why is the candidate’s response vague and ineffective?

Suggestions for Use

After writing your own rough draft response to the guiding prompts, ask the question, “Which parts of these examples are closest to what I have written?” Then read the 4 levels of the matching rubric (labeled with the textbox number) and decide which best matches your response. Use this information as you revise your own written commentary.

Lastly, using your work and/or these examples as reference, consider what you believe would be appropriate artifacts for this textbox.