ETS Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)

Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Culture

Rubric for Step 1: Identifying the Collaborative Team (Textbox 3.1.1)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to select colleagues with various levels of experience who will serve effectively as collaborative team members; to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team; and to establish a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work. The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to select colleagues with various levels of experience who will serve effectively as collaborative team members; to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team; and to establish a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 1.	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to select colleagues with various levels of experience who will serve effectively as collaborative team members; to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team; and to establish a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 1.	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to select colleagues with various levels of experience who will serve effectively as collaborative team members; to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team; and to establish a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 1.

Response for Textbox 3.1.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• an *inappropriate* selection of colleagues with various levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team, with a *disconnected* rationale for the choice of each colleague	• a *cursory* selection of appropriate colleagues with various levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team, with a *partial* rationale for the choice of each colleague	• an *informed* selection of appropriate colleagues with various levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team, with a *logical* rationale for the choice of each colleague	• a *significant* selection of appropriate colleagues with various levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team, with a *detailed* rationale for the choice of each colleague
• *ineffective* steps taken to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team, with an *irrelevant* rationale	• *limited* steps taken to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team, with an *incomplete* rationale	• *effective* steps taken to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team, with an *appropriate* rationale	• *insightful* steps taken to elicit/encourage each colleague's involvement with the team, with a *thorough* rationale
• *little or no* structure that supports and sustains the team during the work, with an *inappropriate* rationale	• a *partial* structure that supports and sustains the team during the work, with an *inconsistent* rationale	• an *effective* structure that supports and sustains the team during the work, with an *appropriate* rationale	• a *significant* structure that supports and sustains the team during the work, with a *thorough* rationale

Rubric for Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture (Textboxes 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a tool (or tools) to collect data; to identify an area of research-based instructional practice in need of improvement; to identify the impact on research-based instructional practice and student learning that the improvement will have; to identify the steps taken to measure the impact; to develop a plan using collected data, with goals, strategies, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan; to determine the impact that the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school's culture; to use strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a tool (or tools) to collect data; to identify an area of research-based instructional practice in need of improvement; to identify the impact on research-based instructional practice and student learning that the improvement will have; to identify the steps taken to measure the impact; to develop a plan using collected data, with goals, strategies, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan; to determine the impact that the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school's culture; to use strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to	A response at the 3 level provides effective evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a tool (or tools) to collect data; to identify an area of research-based instructional practice in need of improvement; to identify the impact on research-based instructional practice and student learning that the improvement will have; to identify the steps taken to measure the impact; to develop a plan using collected data, with goals, strategies, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan; to determine the impact that the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school's culture; to use strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a tool (or tools) to collect data; to identify an area of research-based instructional practice in need of improvement; to identify the impact on research-based instructional practice and student learning that the improvement will have; to identify the steps taken to measure the impact; to develop a plan using collected data, with goals, strategies, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan; to determine the impact that the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school's culture; to use strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
facilitate the team's work by implementing strategies to ensure that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process; and to take steps to reach consensus among the members of the team while creating the plan.

The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 2. Evidence may also be missing. | facilitate the team's work by implementing strategies to ensure that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process; and to take steps to reach consensus among the members of the team while creating the plan.

The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 2. | facilitate the team's work by implementing strategies to ensure that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process; and to take steps to reach consensus among the members of the team while creating the plan.

The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 2. | facilitate the team's work by implementing strategies to ensure that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process; and to take steps to reach consensus among the members of the team while creating the plan*.

The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 2. |

Response for Textbox 3.2.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• the *inappropriate* selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with *little or no* support from the resulting data and a *minimal* rationale for tool selection and use • the targeting of an *inappropriate* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *inappropriate* steps taken to measure the intended impact and an *inconsistent* rationale • the creation of an *irrelevant* plan based on an analysis of the collected data, with *disconnected* goals, strategies, timeline, and resources and with an *ineffective* rationale	• the *partial* selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with *uneven* support from the resulting data and an *uneven* rationale for tool selection and use • the targeting of a *limited* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *weak* steps taken to measure the intended impact and an *incomplete* rationale • the creation of a *cursory* plan based on an analysis of the collected data, with *cursory* goals, strategies, timeline, and resources and with an *incomplete* rationale	• the *appropriate* selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with *appropriate* support from the resulting data and a *connected* rationale for tool selection and use • the targeting of a *relevant* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *effective* steps taken to measure the intended impact and an *effective* rationale • the creation of an *informed* plan based on an analysis of the collected data, with *appropriate* goals, strategies, timeline, and resources and with an *effective* rationale	• the *insightful* selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with *thorough* support from the resulting data and a *tightly connected* rationale for tool selection and use • the targeting of a *significant* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *significant* steps taken to measure the intended impact and a *thorough* rationale • the creation of an *in-depth* plan based on an analysis of the collected data, with *tightly connected* goals, strategies, timeline, and resources and with a *thorough* rationale

Response for Textbox 3.2.1 (continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• an *inappropriate* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan, with *minimal* reasons for selecting them • an *inappropriate* identification of the impact the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school culture with an *ineffective* rationale	• a *cursory* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan, with *tangential* reasons for selecting them • an *partial* identification of the impact the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school culture with a *limited* rationale	• an *informed* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan, with *aligned* reasons for selecting them • an *appropriate* identification of the impact the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school culture with an *effective* rationale	• a *significant* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team's plan, with *extensive* reasons for selecting them • a *significant* identification of the impact the collaborative team will have on the improvement of the school culture with a *thorough* rationale

Response for Textbox 3.2.2

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• *inappropriate* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with *ineffective* examples to support the use of the identified strategies	• *limited* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with *partial* examples to support the use of the identified strategies	• *appropriate* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with *effective* examples to support the use of the identified strategies	• *insightful* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with *thorough* examples to support the use of the identified strategies
• *misinformed* strategies used to ensure that all members of the team were allowed a voice to provide meaningful input related to the goal(s), with *inappropriate* examples to support the strategies	• *limited* strategies used to ensure that all members of the team were allowed a voice to provide meaningful input related to the goal(s), with *loosely connected* examples to support the strategies	• *effective* strategies used to ensure that all members of the team were allowed a voice to provide meaningful input related to the goal(s), with *appropriate* examples to support the strategies	• *significant* strategies used to ensure that all members of the team were allowed a voice to provide meaningful input related to the goal(s), with *detailed* examples to support the strategies
• *irrelevant* resolutions, by the team, of challenges encountered during the planning, with a *minimal* rationale to support the use of the identified strategies	• *inconsistent* resolutions, by the team, of challenges encountered during the planning, with a *vague* rationale to support the use of the identified strategies	• *logical* resolutions, by the team, of challenges encountered during the planning, with an *appropriate* rationale to support the use of the identified strategies	• *in-depth* resolutions, by the team, of challenges encountered during the planning, with an *extensive* rationale to support the use of the identified strategies

Response for Textbox 3.2.2 (continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *little or no* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with *ineffective* examples to support the identified steps	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *uneven* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with partial examples to support the identified steps	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *informed* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with *appropriate* examples to support the identified steps	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *significant* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with *extensive* examples to support the identified steps

Rubric for Step 3: Implementing the Plan to Improve Instruction, Student Learning, and the School Culture (Textbox 3.3.1)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to take steps with the team to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement or feedback to the team members; to	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to take steps with the team to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement or feedback to the team members; to	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to take steps with the team to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement or feedback to the team members; to	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to take steps with the team to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement or feedback to the team members; to

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
work with the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and use that feedback to impact the implementation of the plan; to take steps with the team to ensure that a positive impact on student learning was achieved and that evidence was collected to show that impact; and to take steps with the team to address any challenges that arose during the implementation. The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.	work with the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and use that feedback to impact the implementation of the plan; to take steps with the team to ensure that a positive impact on student learning was achieved and that evidence was collected to show that impact; and to take steps with the team to address any challenges that arose during the implementation. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 3.	work with the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and use that feedback to impact the implementation of the plan; to take steps with the team to ensure that a positive impact on student learning was achieved and that evidence was collected to show that impact; and to take steps with the team to address any challenges that arose during the implementation. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 3.	work with the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience and use that feedback to impact the implementation of the plan; to take steps with the team to ensure that a positive impact on student learning was achieved and that evidence was collected to show that impact; and to take steps with the team to address any challenges that arose during the implementation. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 3.

Response for Textbox 3.3.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• *irrelevant* steps taken with the team to implement the plan, with *little or no* rationale for each step	• *partial* steps taken with the team to implement the plan, with a *limited* rationale for each step	• *relevant* steps taken with the team to implement the plan, with an *effective* rationale for each step	• *significant* steps taken with the team to implement the plan, with a *thorough* rationale for each step
• an *inaccurate* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *minimal* encouragement or feedback offered while implementing the plan	• a *cursory* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *inconsistent* encouragement or feedback offered while implementing the plan	• an *appropriate* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *relevant* encouragement or feedback offered while implementing the plan	• a *significant* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *targeted* encouragement or feedback offered while implementing the plan
• a *trivial* method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience to impact the implementation of the plan and the work of the team as a whole, with examples that are *disconnected*	• a *limited* method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience to impact the implementation of the plan and the work of the team as a whole, with examples that are *loosely connected*	• an *effective* method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience to impact the implementation of the plan and the work of the team as a whole, with examples that are *connected*	• an *in-depth* method used by the team to elicit feedback from the targeted audience to impact the implementation of the plan and the work of the team as a whole, with examples that are *tightly connected*

Response for Textbox 3.3.1 (continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *illogical* steps taken to ensure that the implementation impacted on student learning, with an *inappropriate* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact • *minimal* steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are *disconnected*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *uneven* steps taken to ensure that the implementation impacted on student learning, with a *limited* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact • *partial* steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are *vague*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *logical* steps taken to ensure that the implementation impacted student learning, with an *effective* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact • *effective* steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are *connected*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *consistent* steps taken to ensure that the implementation impacted on student learning, with a *thorough* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact • *significant* steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are *tightly connected*

Rubric for Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team and the School Culture (Textbox 3.4.1)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to evaluate the degree to which the goal of fostering a	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to evaluate the degree to which the goal of fostering a	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to evaluate the extent to which the goal of fostering a	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to evaluate the degree to which the goal of fostering a

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the collaborative team to implement steps before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage self-reflection related to their involvement in the collaborative team; to reflect how feedback from team members will influence future work of building collaborative teams; and to reflect on how the creation of the collaborative team will serve as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture. The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 4. Evidence may also be missing.	collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the collaborative team to implement steps before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage self-reflection related to their involvement in the collaborative team; to reflect how feedback from team members will influence future work of building collaborative teams; and to reflect on how the creation of the collaborative team will serve as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 4.	collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the collaborative team; to implement steps before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage self-reflection related to their involvement in the collaborative team; to reflect how feedback from team members will influence future work of building collaborative teams; and to reflect on how the creation of the collaborative team will serve as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 4.	collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the collaborative team; to implement steps before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage self-reflection related to their involvement in the collaborative team; to reflect how feedback from team members will influence future work of building collaborative teams; and to reflect on how the creation of the collaborative team will serve as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 4.

Response for Textbox 3.4.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• an *inappropriate* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with *ineffective* examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video to support the conclusions	• a *cursory* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with *incomplete* examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video to support the conclusions	• an *effective* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with *appropriate* examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video to support the conclusions	• a *thorough* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with *extensive* examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video to support the conclusions
• a *minimal* evaluation of the team members' professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with *ineffective* examples from the video to support the conclusions	• a *limited* evaluation of the team members' professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with *loosely connected* examples from the video to support the conclusions	• an *informed* evaluation of the team members' professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with *informed* examples from the video to support the conclusions	• an *insightful* evaluation of the team members' professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with *detailed* examples from the video to support the conclusions
• *irrelevant* steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement in a collaborative team, with *minimal* examples from the video to support efforts to promote self-reflection	• *inconsistent* steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement in a collaborative team, with *limited* examples from the video to support efforts to promote self-reflection	• *logical* steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement in a collaborative team, with *effective* examples from the video to support efforts to promote self-reflection	• *significant* steps taken before and during the video-recorded conversation to encourage team members to self-reflect on their involvement in a collaborative team, with *insightful* examples from the video to support efforts to promote self-reflection

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• an *inadequate* reflection on how the feedback provided by the team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams, with examples from the artifacts and/or the video that are *disconnected*	• a *limited* reflection on how the feedback provided by the team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams, with examples from the artifacts and/or the video that are *loosely connected*	• an *informed* reflection on how the feedback provided by the team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams, with examples from the artifacts and/or the video that are *connected*	• an *in-depth* reflection on how the feedback provided by the team members will influence future work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams, with examples from the artifacts and/or the video that are *tightly connected*
• an *ineffective* reflection on the collaborative team as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture	• a *limited* reflection on the collaborative team as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture	• an *effective* reflection on the collaborative team as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture	• an *insightful* reflection on the collaborative team as a vehicle for positive change in the school culture