Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)
Library of Examples – Task 3

PASL Task 3, Step 1, Textbox 3.1.1

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 3.1.1 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: Identifying the Collaborative Team
Textbox 3.1.1: Team Members
Met/Exceeded Standards Level

---

a. The collaborative team consists of the counselor, school psychologist, a general ed teacher, and a resource teacher. The following colleagues were selected to form the team: Team Leader has 5 years of secondary history classroom experience as well as 3 years of administration experience. They have a Master's Degree in Secondary School Administration and a Bachelor's Degree in Social Studies. They were chosen for the group because they provide expertise in school discipline procedures and knowledge of current school climate. As an administrator, the Team Leader also has access to the entire staff and will serve as the liaison for necessary communication to all staff. Colleague A has 1 year of secondary math classroom and 2 years of counselor experience. They have a Master's Degree in School Counseling and a Bachelor's Degree in Math and Secondary Education. They were chosen because they provide insight into specific student issues dealing with family and social welfare. As well as providing access third party resources and agencies. Colleague B has 10 years of secondary Spanish classroom experience. They have a Master's Degree in Spanish and are Character Ed certified. They were chosen for their extensive knowledge in the Character Ed philosophy and data analysis. Colleague C has 16 years of secondary English Language Arts classroom experience. They have a Master's Degree in English and are Character Ed certified. They were chosen for their extensive knowledge in the Character Ed philosophy. A veteran teacher who is respected by staff and collaborates well with colleagues. Colleague D has 11 years of combined special education and science classroom experience. They have dual certification in SPED K-12 and secondary science, with a Master's Degree in SPED and a PBIS certification. They were chosen for their extensive knowledge in the PBIS model and special education caseload for the school.

b. The steps that were taken to elicit each colleagues involvement started with asking a smaller, dedicated group of educators of their interest in the initiative. From there, we discussed their knowledge of the system one on one with potential members. After this interview, we determined which educators would be the best for the committee and which would be available for the necessary training. For the newer members, we communicated the purpose of the team and connected that to the building school improvement plan. We also developed a list of potential roles for the members on the committee to fill to become an active participant. These roles include: creating the agenda, secretary, time keeper and norms, team liaison, data analysis, Tier 2

Team Leader, Tier 3 Team Leader, and an Intervention Coordinator. This process provides potential team members the opportunity to determine their place on the committee and their strengths to bring to the team. School Administration specifically discussed the staff members who would be approached as potential members and met individually with each candidate to explain their rationale for desiring this person's commitment to the committee. These steps encourage active participation in a school wide initiative; while allowing teachers the opportunity to take on a leadership role among their colleagues.

c. There were many structures put into place to support and sustain the team during collaborative work. These include operational structures such as to establish the committee norms and an appropriate amount of time and place to meet, share responsibilities by alternating the roles during the year, and providing a set agenda for the meeting prior to the meeting dates. Other structures include the team supports the implementation of the ideas and determines future action steps for the committee. Our rationale for these steps will help maintain a productive environment for the committee members to continue to work together to implement their strategies. Making sure the group norms apply and are followed so that all meetings stay on target and that all ideas are heard and considered. These systems ensure the committee meetings will be focused and task oriented.

Refer to the Task 3 Rubric for Textbox 3.1.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of identifying a collaborative team, where is there evidence of the following?

- A rationale for the selection of 3-5 colleagues with varying levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team
- A rationale for the steps chosen to elicit and encourage each colleague's involvement with the team
- A rationale for a structure that is aligned to the collaborative work and is designed to support and sustain the team during the work results once the problem/challenge is addressed
- Why is the candidate's response informed and thorough?

Step 1: Identifying the Collaborative Team
Textbox 3.1.1: Team Members
Did not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. A group of colleagues were chosen with varying levels of experience who effectively served alongside of me as collaborative team members. There was a balance of one veteran and one relatively new teacher from each program of tuition-based preschool (including an MPP classroom), Title preschool and early childhood special education. Having one or two educators from each program would provide a balance to the perspectives given during the collaborative time together. The differing levels of experience and expertise allow for different perspectives as well and possible new and old techniques or suggestions of doing things will be provided.

b. Each colleague was encouraged to contribute to the team in at least one specific way. Collaboration within the units in the curriculum was an expectation, as some items needed to be refined and implemented differently due to the setup of the school building and the function of the programs. Each individual on the team would be given a unit from the desired curriculum and asked to generate the activities in the key components of the curriculum that all teachers would be doing in their classroom. A common theme regarding a professional development opportunity is that there are great ideas or expectations that come from that opportunity, but no time to truly implement them realistically. By digging in and completing the "leg work" in

each unit ahead of time, educators would hopefully be more likely to carry out the components of the curriculum without feeling overwhelmed by having to make numerous activities. By sharing that information with the entire team, no one is reinventing the wheel when the expectation is consistent throughout the entire preschool program anyways.

c. In order to support and sustain the team during collaborative work, the team was asked to meet frequently. Weekly literacy-focused meetings were an expectation for the team to attend and to share their unit(s) that they had been working on. Discussion would be given on the units coming in the near future, and the team would look at all activities items that had been constructed and give comments or suggestions pertaining to them specifically.

Refer to the Task 3 Rubric for Textbox 3.1.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of identifying a collaborative team, where is there evidence of the following?

- A rationale for the selection of 3-5 colleagues with varying levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team
- A rationale for the steps chosen to elicit and encourage each colleague's involvement with the team
- A rationale for a structure that is aligned to the collaborative work and is designed to support and sustain the team during the work results once the problem/challenge is addressed
- Why is the candidate's response confusing and limited?

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.