Missouri School Leader Performance Assessment (MoSLPA)

Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Identifying the Collaborative Team (textbox 3.1.1)</th>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides \textit{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 and/or encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team; and to build a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work.</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides \textit{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 and/or encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team; and to build a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work.</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides \textit{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 and/or encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team; and to build a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work.</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides \textit{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 and/or encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team; and to build a structure to support and sustain the team during the collaborative work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is \textit{minimal} and/or \textit{ineffective} throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.

The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is \textit{limited} and/or \textit{vague} throughout the response for Step 1.

The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is \textit{appropriate} and \textit{connected} throughout the response for Step 1.

The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is \textit{insightful} and \textit{thoroughly connected} throughout the response for Step 1.
For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 1 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 *disjointed* rationale for the choice of each team member
- *incomplete* steps taken to elicit and encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team, with an *inconsistent* rationale
- *little or no* structure aligned to the collaborative work and designed to support and sustain the team during the work, with an *inconsistent* rationale

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:
- a *cursory* selection of appropriate colleagues with various levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team, with a *weak* rationale for the choice of each team member
- *limited* steps taken to elicit and encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team, with a *weak* rationale
- a *partial* structure aligned to the collaborative work and designed to support and sustain the team during the work, with a *weak* rationale

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:
- 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 team member
- *effective* steps taken to elicit and encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team, with an *appropriate* rationale
- an *effective* structure aligned to the collaborative work and designed to support and sustain the team during the work, with an *appropriate* rationale

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:
- a *significant* selection of appropriate colleagues with various levels of experience to serve as part of the collaborative team, with a *well-defined* rationale for the choice of each team member
- *insightful* steps taken to elicit and encourage each colleague’s involvement with the team, with a *thorough* rationale
- a *significant* structure aligned to the collaborative work and designed to support and sustain the team during the work, with a *thorough* rationale
### Step 2: Developing a Plan to Improve Instruction (textboxes 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A response at the 1 level</strong> provides <em>minimal</em> 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 student learning that the improvement will have and identify the steps taken to measure the impact; to develop a plan using collected data, with goals, steps, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan; to identify the responsibilities of each team member during the planning; to apply strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to facilitate the team’s work by ensuring that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process;**</td>
<td><strong>A response at the 2 level provides <em>partial</em> 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 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, steps, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan; to identify the responsibilities of each team member during the planning; to apply strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to facilitate the team’s work by ensuring that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process;</strong></td>
<td><strong>A response at the 3 level provides <em>effective</em> 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 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, steps, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan; to identify the responsibilities of each team member during the planning; to apply strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to facilitate the team’s work by ensuring that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process;</strong></td>
<td><strong>A response at the 4 level provides <em>consistent</em> 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 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, steps, a timeline, and resources; to identify colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan; to identify the responsibilities of each team member during the planning; to apply strategies with team members as a group and individually to involve them in the planning process; to facilitate the team’s work by ensuring that each team member has a meaningful voice in the planning process; to resolve challenges as a team during the planning process;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.

The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is **appropriate** and **connected** throughout the response for Step 2.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For <strong>textbox 3.2.1</strong>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</th>
<th>For <strong>textbox 3.2.1</strong>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</th>
<th>For <strong>textbox 3.2.1</strong>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</th>
<th>For <strong>textbox 3.2.1</strong>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• the <em>inadequate</em> selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with <em>little</em> or no support from the resulting data and a <em>minimal</em> rationale</td>
<td>• the <em>weak</em> selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with <em>uneven</em> support from the resulting data and an <em>uneven</em> rationale</td>
<td>• the <em>appropriate</em> selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with <em>appropriate</em> support from the resulting data and a <em>connected</em> rationale</td>
<td>• the <em>highly effective</em> selection and use of a tool (or tools) for identifying a research-based instructional practice in need of improvement, with <em>thorough</em> support from the resulting data and a <em>thoroughly connected</em> rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the targeting of an <em>inappropriate</em> area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with <em>inappropriate</em> steps selected to measure the intended impact and an <em>inconsistent</em> rationale</td>
<td>• the targeting of a <em>narrow</em> area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with <em>weak</em> steps selected to measure the intended impact and a <em>weak</em> rationale</td>
<td>• the targeting of an <em>appropriate</em> area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with <em>appropriate</em> steps selected to measure the intended impact and an <em>appropriate</em> rationale</td>
<td>• the targeting of a <em>significant</em> area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with <em>significant</em> steps selected to measure the intended impact and a <em>thorough</em> rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rubric Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | the creation of an *irrelevant* plan, based on an analysis of the collected data, with *disjointed* goals, steps, timeline, and resources and with an *inconsistent* rationale.  
|       | an *inappropriate* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan, with *minimal* reasons for choosing them. |
| 2     | the creation of a *cursory* plan, based on an analysis of the collected data, with *weak* goals, steps, timeline, and resources and with a *weak* rationale.  
|       | a *cursory* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan, with *cursory* reasons for choosing them |
| 3     | the creation of a *coherent* plan, based on an analysis of the collected data, with *relevant* goals, steps, timeline, and resources and with an *appropriate* rationale.  
|       | a *targeted* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan, with *aligned* reasons for choosing them. |
| 4     | the creation of an *extensive* plan, based on an analysis of the collected data, with *well-defined* goals, steps, timeline, and resources and with a *thorough* rationale.  
|       | a *knowledgeable* identification of colleagues to be the focus of the team’s plan, with *aligned* reasons for choosing them |

For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:

- an *inappropriate* identification of the responsibility that each team member assumed during the planning stage.
- *inadequate* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with examples that *ineffectively* 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 examples that *inappropriately* support the strategies.

For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:

- a *partial* identification of the responsibility that each team member assumed during the planning stage.
- *limited* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with examples that *partially* support the use of the identified 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 examples that are *loosely connected* to the strategies.

For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:

- an *appropriate* identification of the responsibility that each team member assumed during the planning stage.
- *targeted* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with examples that *effectively* support the use of the identified strategies.
- *knowledgeable* strategies used to ensure that all members of the team were allowed a voice to provide meaningful input related to the goal(s), with examples that *appropriately* support the strategies.

For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:

- a *thorough* identification of the responsibility that each team member assumed during the planning stage.
- *insightful* strategies used with team members, both individually and as a group, to involve them in the planning process, with examples that *thoroughly* support the use of the identified 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 examples that *consistently* support the strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incomplete resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that minimally supports the actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that inadequately support the identified steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that vaguely supports the actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneven steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that lack detail supporting the identified steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that appropriately supports the actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that appropriately support the identified steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that extensively supports the actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that thoroughly support the identified steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 3: Implementing the Plan (textbox 3.3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides minimal evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to work with the team to determine the steps to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement to the team members; to work with a 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.</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides partial evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to work with the team to determine the steps to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement to the team members; to work with a 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.</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides effective evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to work with the team to determine the steps to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement to the team members; to work with a 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.</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides consistent evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to work with the team to determine the steps to implement the plan; to identify the responsibilities assumed by each team member while implementing the plan; to offer encouragement to the team members; to work with a 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is minimal and/or ineffective.
The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is limited and/or vague.
The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is appropriate and connected.
The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is insightful and thoroughly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.</th>
<th>throughout the response for Step 3.</th>
<th>throughout the response for Step 3.</th>
<th>connected throughout the response for Step 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **For textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:  
- *incomplete* steps taken to implement the plan, with *little* or *no* rationale for each step  
- an *inaccurate* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *minimal* encouragement offered at *inappropriate* times and for *inappropriate* reasons with examples that are *disconnected*  
- an *inadequate* 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 *minimal*  
- *incomplete* steps taken to ensure that the implementation had an impact on student learning, with an *inappropriate* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact | **For textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:  
- *partial* steps taken to implement the plan, with a *limited* rationale for each step  
- a * cursory* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *inconsistent* encouragement offered at *inconsistent* times and for *inconsistent* reasons with examples that are *vague*  
- 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*  
- *uneven* steps taken to ensure that the implementation had an impact on student learning, with a *limited* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact | **For textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:  
- *effective* steps taken to implement the plan, with a *specific* rationale for each step  
- an *appropriate* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *targeted* encouragement offered at *appropriate* times and for *appropriate* reasons with examples that are *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*  
- *targeted* steps taken to ensure that the implementation had an impact on student learning, with an *effective* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact | **For textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:  
- *significant* steps taken to implement the plan, with a *thorough* rationale for each step  
- a *significant* identification of the responsibilities assumed by each team member, with evidence of *targeted* encouragement offered at *numerous* times and for *insightful* reasons with examples that are *well-defined*  
- 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 *thorough*  
- *consistent* steps taken to ensure that the implementation had an impact on student learning, with a *thorough* evidence-collecting process used to show the impact |
| Misinformed steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are disconnected | Partial steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are vague | Coherent steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are connected | Significant steps taken by the team to address challenges that arose during the implementation, with examples that are thoroughly connected |
## Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team (textbox 3.4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides <em>minimal</em> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to evaluate the degree to which the goal of fostering a collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the professional team; to implement steps before and during conversations to encourage reflective conversation among team members; and to describe how feedback from colleagues will influence work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future. The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <em>minimal</em> and/or <em>ineffective</em> throughout the response for Step 4. Evidence may also be missing.</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides <em>partial</em> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to evaluate the degree to which the goal of fostering a collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the professional team; to implement steps before and during conversations to encourage reflective conversation among team members; and to describe how feedback from colleagues will influence work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <em>limited</em> and/or <em>vague</em> throughout the response for Step 4.</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides <em>effective</em> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to evaluate the extent to which the goal of fostering a collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the professional team; to implement steps before and during conversations to encourage reflective conversation among team members; and to describe how feedback from colleagues will influence work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <em>appropriate</em> and <em>connected</em> throughout the response for Step 4.</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides <em>consistent</em> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to evaluate the degree to which the goal of fostering a collaborative team was met; to evaluate the professional growth of team members as partners in the professional team; to implement steps before and during conversations to encourage reflective conversation among team members; and to describe how feedback from colleagues will influence work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <em>insightful</em> and <em>thoroughly connected</em> throughout the response for Step 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

**For textbox 3.4.1, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:**

- An *incomplete* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video that *ineffectively* support the conclusions
- A *minimal* evaluation of the team members’ professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with examples from the video that *inventively* support the conclusions
- Irrelevant steps taken before and during conversations to encourage team members’ self-reflection related to their involvement in a collaborative team, with examples from the video that *minimally* support efforts to promote self-reflection
- An *inadequate* explanation of how the feedback provided by the team members will influence the candidate’s work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future, with examples from the

**For textbox 3.4.1, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:**

- A *cursory* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video that *partially* support the conclusions
- A *limited* evaluation of the team members’ professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with examples from the video that *lack detail* supporting the conclusions
- *Inconsistent* steps taken before and during conversations to encourage team members’ self-reflection related to their involvement in a collaborative team, with examples from the video that *partially* support efforts to promote self-reflection
- An *inadequate* explanation of how the feedback provided by the team members will influence the candidate’s work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future, with examples from the

**For textbox 3.4.1, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:**

- An *effective* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video that *appropriately* support the conclusions
- An *informed* evaluation of the team members’ professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with examples from the video that *effectively* support the conclusions
- Logical steps taken before and during conversations to encourage team members’ self-reflection related to their involvement in a collaborative team, with examples from the video that *effectively* support efforts to promote self-reflection
- An *informed* explanation of how the feedback provided by the team members will influence the candidate’s work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future, with examples from the

**For textbox 3.4.1, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:**

- A *thorough* evaluation of the extent to which a collaborative team was fostered, with examples from the plan, artifacts, and/or video that *consistently* support the conclusions
- An *insightful* evaluation of the team members’ professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with examples from the video that *extensively* support the conclusions
- Significant steps taken before and during conversations to encourage team members’ self-reflection related to their involvement in a collaborative team, with examples from the video that *inventfully* support efforts to promote self-reflection
- An *in-depth* explanation of how the feedback provided by the team members will influence the candidate’s work with other colleagues when building collaborative teams in the future, with examples from the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are disconnected</th>
<th>plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are loosely connected</th>
<th>the plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are effectively linked</th>
<th>plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are thoroughly connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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