ETS Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)

Task 1: Problem Solving in the Field

Rubric for Step 1: Identifying a Problem/Challenge (Textbox 1.1.1)

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 identify a significant problem/challenge and its impact on instructional practice and student learning; to collect appropriate longitudinal data that support the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate the results of addressing the problem/challenge and the impact that the results will have on instructional	A response at the 2-level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a significant problem/challenge and its impact on instructional practice and student learning; to collect appropriate longitudinal data that support the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate the results of addressing the problem/challenge and the impact that the results will have on instructional	A response at the 3-level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a significant problem/challenge and its impact on instructional practice and student learning; to collect appropriate longitudinal data that support the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate the results of addressing the problem/challenge and the impact that the results will have on instructional	A response at the 4-level provides *extensive* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to identify a significant problem/challenge and its impact on instructional practice and student learning; to collect appropriate longitudinal data that support the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate the results of addressing the problem/challenge and the impact that the results will have on

Rubric for Step 1 (continued)

practice and student learning. 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.	practice and student learning. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 1.	practice and student learning. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 1.	instructional practice and student learning. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 1.

Score of 0 for Step 1

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 1 for at least one of the following reasons.

- **No written response is in the Task 1—Step 1 textbox.**
- **The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 1—Step 1.**
- **The artifact attachment contains only hyperlinks.**
- **None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 1 textboxes.**
  - Representative page of longitudinal data

Response for Textbox 1.1.1

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 *inaccurate* selection of a significant problem/ challenge that impacts instructional practice and student learning, with *trivial* examples linked to the impact • *little or no* use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge • an *inappropriate* identification of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/ challenge, with an *irrelevant* identification of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning	• a *cursory* selection of a significant problem/ challenge that impacts instructional practice and student learning, with *loosely connected* examples linked to the impact • *a limited* use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge • a *partial* identification of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/ challenge, with a *confusing* identification of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning	• an *appropriate* selection of a significant problem/ challenge that impacts instructional practice and student learning, with *effective* examples linked to the impact • *an appropriate* use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge • a *relevant* identification of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/ challenge, with an *appropriate* identification of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning	• an *insightful* selection of a significant problem/ challenge that impacts instructional practice and student learning, with *significant* examples tightly linked to the impact • *an extensive* use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge • an *insightful* identification of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/ challenge, with a *significant* identification of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning

Rubric for Step 2: Researching and Developing a Plan (Textboxes 1.2.1 and 1.2.2)

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 conduct and/or consult research that influences the development of a plan; to explain how school and/or district resources affect the development of the plan; to demonstrate how school/community /cultural influences affect the development of the plan; to develop a plan and identify achievable results; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify individuals and their roles in the development of the plan; to determine strategies to communicate	A response at the 2-level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to conduct and/or consult research that influences the development of a plan; to explain how school and/or district resources affect the development of the plan; to demonstrate how school/ community /cultural influences affect the development of the plan; to develop a plan and identify achievable results; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify individuals and their roles in the development of the plan; to determine strategies to communicate	A response at the 3-level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to conduct and/or consult research that influences the development of a plan; to explain how school and/or district resources affect the development of the plan; to demonstrate how school/ community /cultural influences affect the development of the plan; to develop a plan and identify achievable results; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify individuals and their roles in the development of the plan; to determine strategies to communicate	A response at the 4-level provides *thorough* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to conduct and/or consult research that influences the development of a plan; to explain how school and/or district resources affect the development of the plan; to demonstrate how school/ community /cultural influences affect the development of the plan; to develop a plan and identify achievable results; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify individuals and their roles in the development of the plan; to determine strategies to communicate

the plan to various audiences; and to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work. 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.	the plan to various audiences; and to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 2.	the plan to various audiences; and to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 2.	the plan to various audiences; and to assess the results of the plan and its impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 2.

Score of 0 for Step 2

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 2 for at least one of the following reasons.

- **No written response is in any of the Task 1—Step 2 textboxes.**

- **The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 1—Step 2.**

- **The artifact attachments contain only hyperlinks.**

- **None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 1 textboxes.**

   o   Representative page of the research materials and resources you used to inform the development of the plan

   o   Representative pages of the plan

   o   Representative page of your timeline and steps

Response for Textbox 1.2.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: *inappropriate* identification of significant research and the influence of the research on the development of the plan • *trivial* identification of the influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan • *minimal* identification of the influence of school/community/ cultural influences on the development of the plan	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *inconsistent* identification of significant research and the influence of the research on the development of the plan • *uneven* identification of the influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan • *limited* identification of the influence of school/community/ cultural influences on the development of the plan	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *appropriate* identification of significant research and the influence of the research on the development of the plan • *informed* identification of the influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan • *appropriate* identification of the influence of school/community/ cultural influences on the development of the plan	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *insightful* identification of significant research and the influence of the research on the development of the plan • *extensive* identification of the influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan • *significant* identification of the influence of school/community/ cultural influences on the development of the plan

Response for Textbox 1.2.2

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:
• a *minimal* plan designed to resolve the problem/challenge	• a *partial* plan designed to resolve the problem/challenge	• an *effective* plan designed to resolve the problem/challenge	• an *extensive* plan designed to resolve the problem/challenge
• *little or no* timeline for each step within the plan and a *disconnected* rationale for each timeline	• a *vague* timeline for each step within the plan and an *irrelevant* rationale for each timeline	• an *appropriate* timeline for each step within the plan and an *informed* rationale for each timeline	• a *substantive* timeline for each step within the plan and an *insightful* rationale for each timeline
• *trivial* identification of individuals to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they played	• *limited* identification of individuals to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they played	• *relevant* identification of individuals to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they played	• *detailed* identification of individuals to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they played
• *ineffective* strategies used for communicating the plan to various audiences, with *little* or *no* rationale for their choice	• *cursory* strategies used for communicating the plan to various audiences, with a *loosely connected* rationale for their choice	• *relevant* strategies used for communicating the plan to various audiences, with an *effective* rationale for their choice	• *in-depth* strategies used for communicating the plan to various audiences, with a *tightly connected* rationale for their choice

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 ineffective method of assessing the results of the plan, including its impact on instructional practice and student learning as demonstrated by student work, with an ineffective rationale for the choice of student work	• a limited method of assessing the results of the plan, including its impact on instructional practice and student learning as demonstrated by student work, with a loosely connected rationale for the choice of student work	• an effective method of assessing the results of the plan, including its impact on instructional practice and student learning as demonstrated by student work, with an informed rationale for the choice of student work	• a significant method of assessing the results of the plan, including its impact on instructional practice and student learning as demonstrated by student work, with an extensive rationale for the choice of student work

Rubric for Step 3: Implementing the Plan (Textboxes 1.3.1 and 1.3.2)

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 support the implementation of the plan; to identify the individuals included in the plan's implementation and explain why and how they were included; to identify communication strategies used with team members and the impact of the strategies on the implementation of the plan; to determine criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; to identify any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to analyze the effectiveness of the plan; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.	A response at the 2-level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify the individuals included in the plan's implementation and explain why and how they were included; to identify communication strategies used with team members and the impact of the strategies on the implementation of the plan; to determine criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; to identify any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to analyze the effectiveness of the plan; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.	A response at the 3-level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify the individuals included in the plan's implementation and explain why and how they were included; to identify communication strategies used with team members and the impact of the strategies on the implementation of the plan; to determine criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; to identify any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to analyze the effectiveness of the plan; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.	A response at the 4-level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify the individuals included in the plan's implementation and explain why and how they were included; to identify communication strategies used with team members and the impact of the strategies on the implementation of the plan; to determine criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan; to identify any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to analyze the effectiveness of the plan; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.

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.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is limited and/or vague throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is appropriate and connected throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is insightful and tightly connected throughout the response for Step 3.

Score of 0 for Step 3

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 3 for at least one of the following reasons.

- **No written response is in any of the Task 1—Step 3 textboxes.**

- **The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 1—Step 3.**

- **The artifact attachments contain only hyperlinks.**

- **None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 1 textboxes.**

    o Representative page of your communication with stakeholders

    o Representative page of an artifact of your choice that reflects any adjustments and/or results related to the implementation of the plan (e.g., meeting notes, e-mails to stakeholders)

    o Representative page of student work

Response for Textbox 1.3.1

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:
• *minimal* actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are *disconnected* from the identified actions	• *limited* actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are *loosely connected* to the identified actions	• *informed* actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are *aligned* to the identified actions	• *significant* actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are *tightly connected* to the identified actions
• an *inappropriate* selection of members to implement the plan and an *ineffective* rationale for why and how these members were included	• a *partial* selection of members to implement the plan and a *confusing* rationale for why and how these members were included	• an *appropriate* selection of members to implement the plan and an *informed* rationale for why and how these members were included	• an *insightful* selection of members to implement the plan and an *in-depth* rationale for why and how these members were included
• *ineffective* strategies used to communicate with team members and an *ineffective* rationale for selecting these strategies and identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan	• *partial* strategies used to communicate with team members and an *incomplete* rationale for selecting these strategies and identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan	• *effective* strategies used to communicate with team members and a *logical* rationale for selecting these strategies and identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan	• *substantive* strategies used to communicate with team members and a *detailed* rationale for selecting these strategies and identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan

Response for Textbox 1.3.2

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:
• an *illogical* identification of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan, with a *disconnected* rationale for the choice of criteria and methods • *ineffective* adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with a *disconnected* rationale for these adjustments • *minimal* identification of the impact of the plan's implementation on the problem/challenge, with *few or no* examples • *little* or *no* analysis of the impact of the plan's implementation on instructional practice and student learning, with *minimal* examples	• an *inconsistent* identification of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan, with a *limited* rationale for the choice of criteria and methods • *inconsistent* adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with a *limited* rationale for these adjustments • *uneven* identification of the impact of the plan's implementation on the problem/challenge, with *confusing* examples • *partial* analysis of the impact of the plan's implementation on instructional practice and student learning, with *loosely connected* examples	• a *relevant* identification of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan, with an *informed* rationale for the choice of criteria and methods • *logical* adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with an *informed* rationale for these adjustments • *informed* identification of the impact of the plan's implementation on the problem/challenge, with *connected* examples • *appropriate* analysis of the impact of the plan's implementation on instructional practice and student learning, with *connected* examples	• a *detailed* identification of the criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan, with a *thorough* rationale for the choice of criteria and methods • *insightful* adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with a *thorough* rationale for these adjustments • *substantive* identification of the impact of the plan's implementation on the problem/challenge, with *in-depth* examples • *significant* analysis of the impact of the plan's implementation on instructional practice and student learning, with *extensive* examples

Rubric for Step 4: Reflecting on the Plan and the Resolution (Textbox 1.4.1)

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 reflect on the effectiveness of the resolution to determine changes that could be made to the development and implementation process; to reflect on the entire process of development and implementation and determine lessons learned; and to reflect on how what has been learned will influence future problem-solving tasks.	A response at the 2-level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the resolution to determine changes that could be made to the development and implementation process; to reflect on the entire process of development and implementation and determine lessons learned; and to reflect on how what has been learned will influence future problem-solving tasks.	A response at the 3-level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the resolution to determine changes that could be made to the development and implementation process; to reflect on the entire process of development and implementation and determine lessons learned; and to reflect on how what has been learned will influence future problem-solving tasks.	A response at the 4-level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the resolution to determine changes that could be made to the development and implementation process; to reflect on the entire process of development and implementation and determine lessons learned; and to reflect on how what has been learned will influence future problem-solving tasks.
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.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 4.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 4.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 4.

Rubric for Step 4 (continued)

Score of 0 for Step 4

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 4 for at least one of the following reasons.

- **No written response is in any of the Task 1—Step 4 textboxes.**

- **The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 1—Step 4.**

Response for Textbox 1.4.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *irrelevant* identification of changes that could be made to the development and implementation processes for use in similar situations, with *few or no* examples • *ineffective* reflection on lessons learned from the entire process of developing and implementing the plan, with *inappropriate* examples • *minimal* identification of how what has been learned will influence future approaches to problem-solving tasks, with *inappropriate* examples	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *limited* identification of changes that could be made to the development and implementation processes for use in similar situations, with *loosely connected* examples • *partial* reflection on lessons learned from the entire process of developing and implementing the plan, with *limited* examples • *inconsistent* identification of how what has been learned will influence future approaches to problem-solving tasks, with *limited* examples	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *effective* identification of changes that could be made to the development and implementation processes for use in similar situations, with *relevant* examples • *relevant* reflection on lessons learned from the entire process of developing and implementing the plan, with *appropriate* examples • *informed* identification of how what has been learned will influence future approaches to problem-solving tasks, with *appropriate* examples	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *substantive* identification of the changes that could be made to the development and implementation processes for use in similar situations, with *detailed* examples • *substantive* reflection on lessons learned from the entire process of developing and implementing the plan, with *insightful* examples • *significant* identification of how what has been learned will influence future approaches to problem-solving tasks, with *insightful* examples