Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)

Score Report Feedback

Task 2: Supporting Continuous Professional Development

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 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.

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.

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

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

**Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development**

There may be evidence of inappropriate strategies and/or techniques chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, with a weak rationale for the choices. The strategies/techniques may also be trivial. There may be evidence of an ineffective selection of appropriate individuals to participate in the professional development, with little or no rationale for these selections. There may be inappropriate evidence of approaches used to facilitate the professional development, with little or no rationale for the selected approaches; the identified approaches may be trivial. There may be weak evidence that the assignments given to participants and/or students affects instructional practice and student learning and little or no connection between the assignments and the professional development experience. 2.2.1

**Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants’ Responses**

The response may provide weak evidence for the selection of three participants with different levels of experience, and there may be inappropriate rationales for the selected participants and how the professional development experience affected them. There may be little or no evidence of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of each participant, with irrelevant examples. There may be little or no identification of the method of follow-up for each participant, and the rationale may be weak or inappropriate. There may be little or no 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 weak or missing. 2.3.1

**Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development**

The response may provide little or no 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 weak or missing. The feedback survey design may have included inappropriate topics to elicit a response from the participants, or there is minimal or inaccurate analysis of the feedback. There may be little or no evidence of the modifications that could be made to the current professional development process. The rationale may include little or no analysis of all the aspects of the professional development experience. There may be little or no evidence of the implications on all aspects of the experience or of how these implications support continuous professional development. There may be an inappropriate 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

**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: Designing Building-level Professional Development**

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**

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 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**

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

**Score Level 3**

**Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development**

The response provides appropriate evidence of the involvement of individuals in the development of the prioritized list, with clear reasons for their selection. There is relevant evidence that the team used a process to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goals. The accurate use of appropriate data was 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. Further evidence of research-based support for the plan may be needed. The connection between prioritized needs, the building or district goals, and/or the state goals is effective. 2.1.1

The response provides an appropriate selection of a need chosen from the prioritized list, with a logical rationale for the selection. There is clear evidence of the development of goals for the professional development plan and for determining whether the goal or goals are achieved. There is effective evidence of the professional development plan’s impact on instructional practice and student learning. The response includes the identification of relevant research to support the professional development, with an appropriate connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. There is clear evidence of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development. The response provides appropriate evidence of the individuals’ involvement in the creation of the professional development plan and includes a clear rationale for choosing these individuals. There is relevant evidence in the response of follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, and the rationale for the follow-up is appropriate. 2.1.2

**Step 2: Implementing Building-level Professional Development**

The response provides appropriate evidence of strategies and/or techniques that were chosen to communicate the importance of the professional development, with a logical rationale for the choices. There is relevant evidence that describes the selection of appropriate individuals to participate in the professional development, with an effective rationale for these selections. There is appropriate evidence of approaches used to facilitate the professional development, with a logical rationale for the selected approaches. There is evidence of appropriate strategies used to actively engage the teachers, with an effective rationale for the selected strategies. There is relevant evidence that the assignments given to participants and/or students affects instructional practice and student learning, and there is an informed 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
Step 4: Reflecting on Building-level Professional Development

The response provides evidence of relevant 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 clear and appropriate. There is good evidence that describes the modifications that could be made to the current professional development process, with an effective rationale based on all aspects of the professional development experience. There is relevant evidence of the implications on all aspects of the experience and of how these implications support continuous professional development. There is an appropriate 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

Score Level 4

Step 1: Designing Building-level Professional Development

The response provides thorough evidence of the involvement of individuals in the development of the prioritized list, with detailed reasons for their selection. There is an excellent amount of evidence that the team used a process to develop a prioritized list of significant professional development needs aligned with the building, district, and/or state goals. There is an insightful 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 is in-depth. 2.1.1

The response provides a thorough selection of need(s) chosen from the prioritized list, with a significant rationale for the selection. There is insightful evidence of the development of goals for the professional development plan and for determining whether the goal or goals are achieved. There is excellent evidence of the professional development plan’s impact on instructional practice and student learning. The response includes the identification of substantive research to support the professional development, with a thorough connection between the research and the identified focus of the professional development plan. There is detailed evidence of other factors that influenced the creation of the building-level professional development. The response provides significant evidence of the individuals’ involvement in the creation of the professional development plan and includes an analytic rationale for choosing these individuals. There is evidence in the response of significant follow-up that supports the implementation of the professional development, and the rationale for the follow-up is thorough. 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

**Step 3: Analyzing Three Participants’ Responses**

The response provides significant evidence for the selection of three participants with different levels of experience, and there are thorough rationales for the selected participants and how the professional development experience affected them. There is detailed evidence of how the professional development influenced the instructional practices of each participant, with excellent examples. There is a thorough identification of the method of follow-up for each participant, and the rationale is consistent. There is thorough evidence of the impact of each participant’s professional development on student learning, with significant examples from the student work sample to support the conclusions. 2.3.1

**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