

# Missouri School Leader Performance Assessment (MoSLPA)

## Task 1 Problem Solving in the Field Rubric

Step 1: Identifying a Problem/Challenge (textbox 1.1.1)			
Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
<p>A response at the 1 level provides <i>minimal</i> 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 longitudinal data that supports the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate results once the problem/challenge is addressed, including anticipating the impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is</p>	<p>A response at the 2 level provides <i>partial</i> 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 longitudinal data that supports the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate results once the problem/challenge is addressed, including anticipating the impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is</p>	<p>A response at the 3 level provides <i>effective</i> 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 longitudinal data that supports the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate results once the problem/challenge is addressed, including anticipating the impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is</p>	<p>A response at the 4 level provides <i>extensive</i> 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 longitudinal data that supports the choice of a problem/challenge; and to anticipate results once the problem/challenge is addressed, including anticipating the impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is</p>

<p><b><i>minimal and/or ineffective throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>limited and/or vague throughout the response for Step 1.</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>appropriate and connected throughout the response for Step 1.</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>insightful and thoroughly connected throughout the response for Step 1.</i></b></p>
<p>For <b>textbox 1.1.1</b>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>inaccurate</i> identification of a significant problem/challenge, with a <i>minimal</i> identification of the impact of the problem/challenge on instructional practice and student learning and examples that are <i>inaccurately</i> linked to the impact</li> <li>• <i>little or no</i> use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge</li> <li>• an <i>inappropriate</i> description of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/challenge, with an <i>incomplete</i> description of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.1.1</b>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i> cursory</i> identification of a significant problem/challenge, with a <i>limited</i> identification of the impact of the problem/challenge on instructional practice and student learning and examples that are <i>loosely connected</i> to the impact</li> <li>• <i>limited</i> use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge</li> <li>• a <i>partial</i> description of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/challenge, with a <i>confusing</i> description of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.1.1</b>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>appropriate</i> identification of a significant problem/challenge, with an <i>appropriate</i> identification of the impact of the problem/challenge on instructional practice and student learning and examples that are <i>effectively</i> linked to the impact</li> <li>• <i>appropriate</i> use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge</li> <li>• a <i>targeted</i> description of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/challenge, with an <i>appropriate</i> description of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.1.1</b>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>insightful</i> identification of a significant problem/challenge, with a <i>well-defined</i> identification of the impact of the problem/challenge on instructional practice and student learning and examples that are <i>thoroughly</i> linked to the impact</li> <li>• <i>extensive</i> use of longitudinal data collected to support the choice of the significant problem/challenge</li> <li>• an <i>insightful</i> description of the anticipated results of resolving the problem/challenge, with a <i>well-defined</i> description of the anticipated impact on instructional practice and student learning</li> </ul>

**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
<p>A response at the 1 level provides <i>minimal</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to conduct research that directly influences the development of a plan connected to the building or community; to identify school and/or district resources that 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 goals; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify colleagues and their roles in the development of the plan; to develop strategies to communicate the plan to various audiences; and to determine how the results of the plan will be assessed, including the plan’s impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work.</p>	<p>A response at the 2 level provides <i>partial</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to conduct research that directly influences the development of a plan connected to the building or community; to identify school and/or district resources that 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 goals; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify colleagues and their roles in the development of the plan; to develop strategies to communicate the plan to various audiences; and to determine how the results of the plan will be assessed, including the plan’s impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work.</p>	<p>A response at the 3 level provides <i>effective</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to conduct research that directly influences the development of a plan connected to the building or community; to identify school and/or district resources that 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 goals; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify colleagues and their roles in the development of the plan; to develop strategies to communicate the plan to various audiences; and to determine how the results of the plan will be assessed, including the plan’s impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work.</p>	<p>A response at the 4 level provides <i>thorough</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to conduct research that directly influences the development of a plan connected to the building or community; to identify school and/or district resources that 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 goals; to develop a timeline for each step of the plan; to identify colleagues and their roles in the development of the plan; to develop strategies to communicate the plan to various audiences; and to determine how the results of the plan will be assessed, including the plan’s impact on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work.</p>

<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <i>minimal</i> and/or <i>ineffective</i> throughout the response for Step 2. Evidence may also be missing.</p>	<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <i>limited</i> and/or <i>vague</i> throughout the response for Step 2.</p>	<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <i>appropriate</i> and <i>connected</i> throughout the response for Step 2.</p>	<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <i>insightful</i> and <i>thoroughly connected</i> throughout the response for Step 2.</p>
<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.1</b>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>incomplete</i> influence of the research on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>trivial</i> influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>minimal</i> influence of school/community/cultural influences on the development of the plan</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.1</b>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>inconsistent</i> influence of the research on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>uneven</i> influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>limited</i> influence of school/community/cultural influences on the development of the plan</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.1</b>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>appropriate</i> influence of the research on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>targeted</i> influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>appropriate</i> influence of school/community/cultural influences on the development of the plan</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.1</b>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>significant</i> influence of the research on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>extensive</i> influence of school and/or district resources on the development of the plan</li> <li>• <i>significant</i> influence of school/community/cultural influences on the development of the plan</li> </ul>
<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.2</b>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>disjointed</i> plan that includes goals to be achieved as a result of the plan</li> <li>• <i>little or no</i> timeline for each step within the plan and a disjointed rationale for the timeline</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.2</b>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>partial</i> plan that includes goals to be achieved as a result of the plan</li> <li>• a <i>vague</i> timeline for each step within the plan and an <i>irrelevant</i> rationale for the timeline</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.2</b>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>detailed</i> plan that includes goals to be achieved as a result of the plan</li> <li>• an <i>appropriate</i> timeline for each step within the plan and an <i>informed</i> rationale for the timeline</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.2.2</b>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>extensive</i> plan that includes goals to be achieved as a result of the plan</li> <li>• a <i>substantive</i> timeline for each step within the plan and an <i>insightful</i> rationale for the timeline</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>incomplete</i> identification of colleagues to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they will play</li> <li>• <i>incomplete</i> strategies for communicating the plan to various audiences, with a <i>limited</i> rationale for the strategies</li> <li>• a <i>disjointed</i> plan to assess the results, including the impact of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work, with an <i>incomplete</i> rationale for the choice of student work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>limited</i> identification of colleagues to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they will play</li> <li>• <i>weak</i> strategies for communicating the plan to various audiences, with a <i>loosely connected</i> rationale for the strategies</li> <li>• a <i>limited</i> plan to assess the results, including the impact of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work, with a <i>loosely connected</i> rationale for the choice of student work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>targeted</i> identification of colleagues to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they will play</li> <li>• <i>relevant</i> strategies for communicating the plan to various audiences, with an <i>effective</i> rationale for the strategies</li> <li>• an <i>effective</i> plan to assess the results, including the impact of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work, with a <i>detailed</i> rationale for the choice of student work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>well-defined</i> identification of colleagues to help develop the plan, the reasons for their selection, and the roles they will play</li> <li>• <i>in-depth</i> strategies for communicating the plan to various audiences, with a <i>thoroughly connected</i> rationale for the strategies</li> <li>• a <i>well-defined</i> plan to assess the results, including the impact of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, as demonstrated by student work, with an <i>extensive</i> rationale for the choice of student work</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

**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
<p>A response at the 1 level provides <i>minimal</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify and justify the choice of colleagues who were included in the plan's implementation; to communicate with team members and identify their impact on the implementation of the plan; to explain the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge; to determine criteria and a method to monitor the implementation of the plan; to explain any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to explain the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p>	<p>A response at the 2 level provides <i>partial</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify and justify the choice of colleagues who were included in the plan's implementation; to communicate with team members and to identify their impact on the implementation of the plan; to explain how the implementation of the plan addressed the problem/challenge; to determine criteria and a method to monitor the implementation of the plan; to explain any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to explain the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p>	<p>A response at the 3 level provides <i>effective</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify and justify the choice of colleagues who were included in the plan's implementation; to communicate with team members and to identify their impact on the implementation of the plan; to explain how the implementation of the plan addressed the problem/challenge; to determine criteria and a method to monitor the implementation of the plan; to make any adjustments during the implementation of the plan; to identify the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p>	<p>A response at the 4 level provides <i>consistent</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate's ability to support the implementation of the plan; to identify and justify the choice of colleagues who were included in the plan's implementation; to communicate with team members and to identify their impact on the implementation of the plan; to explain how the implementation of the plan addressed the problem/challenge; to determine criteria and a method to monitor the implementation of the plan; to explain any adjustments made during the implementation of the plan; to explain the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge; and to explain the plan's impact on instructional practice and student learning.</p>

<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <i>minimal</i> and/or <i>ineffective</i> throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.</p>	<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <i>limited</i> and/or <i>vague</i> throughout the response for Step 3.</p>	<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <i>appropriate</i> and <i>connected</i> throughout the response for Step 3.</p>	<p>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <i>insightful</i> and <i>thoroughly connected</i> throughout the response for Step 3.</p>
<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.1</b>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>minimal</i> actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are <i>ineffectively connected</i> with the identified actions</li> <li>• an <i>simplistic</i> process used to select members to implement the plan and an <i>ineffective</i> rationale for including these members</li> <li>• <i>ineffectual strategies</i> used to communicate with team members and an <i>incomplete</i> rationale for selecting these strategies and for identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.1</b>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>limited</i> actions taken to support the implementation of the plan with examples that are <i>loosely connected</i> with the identified actions</li> <li>• a <i>confusing</i> process used to select members to implement the plan and a <i>confusing</i> rationale for including these members</li> <li>• <i>partial</i> strategies used to communicate with team members and an <i>ineffective</i> rationale for selecting these strategies and for identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.1</b>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>detailed</i> actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are <i>aligned</i> with the identified actions</li> <li>• an <i>integrated</i> process used to select members to implement the plan and an <i>integrated</i> rationale for including these members</li> <li>• <i>effective</i> strategies used to communicate with team members and a <i>coherent</i> rationale for selecting these strategies and for identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.1</b>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>significant</i> actions taken to support the implementation of the plan, with examples that are <i>thoroughly connected</i> to the identified actions</li> <li>• an <i>in-depth</i> process used to select members to implement the plan and an <i>in-depth</i> rationale for including these members</li> <li>• <i>substantive</i> strategies used to communicate with team members and a <i>detailed</i> rationale for selecting these strategies and for identifying their impact on the implementation of the plan</li> </ul>

<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.2</b>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>illogical</i> choice of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan</li> <li>• <i>ineffective</i> adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with a <i>disjointed</i> rationale for these adjustments</li> <li>• <i>minimal</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge, with <i>minimal</i> examples</li> <li>• <i>little or no</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, with <i>minimal</i> examples</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.2</b>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>confusing</i> choice of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan</li> <li>• <i>weak</i> adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with an <i>inconclusive</i> rationale for these adjustments</li> <li>• <i>limited</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge, with <i>limited</i> examples</li> <li>• <i>partial</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, with <i>limited</i> examples</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.2</b>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>relevant</i> choice of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan</li> <li>• <i>logical</i> adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with a <i>detailed</i> rationale for these adjustments</li> <li>• <i>targeted</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge, with <i>specific</i> examples</li> <li>• <i>appropriate</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, with <i>specific</i> examples</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.3.2</b>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>well-detailed</i> choice of criteria and methods used to monitor the implementation of the plan</li> <li>• <i>insightful</i> adjustments made during the implementation of the plan, with a <i>thoroughly</i> explained rationale for these adjustments</li> <li>• <i>well-defined</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on the problem/challenge, with <i>thoroughly</i> aligned examples</li> <li>• <i>significant</i> evidence of the impact of the implementation of the plan on instructional practice and student learning, with <i>extensive</i> examples</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--



**Step 4: Reflecting on the Plan and Resolution (textbox 1.4.1)**

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
<p>A response at the 1 level provides <i>minimal</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the entire process of the plan; to project changes that could be made in similar situations; and to explain lessons learned from the implementation of the plan and explain the impact that those lessons will have on future problem-solving tasks.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <i>minimal</i> and/or <i>ineffective</i> throughout the response for Step 4. Evidence may also be missing.</p>	<p>A response at the 2 level provides <i>partial</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the entire process of the plan; to project changes that could be made in similar situations; and to explain lessons learned from the implementation of the plan and explain the impact that those lessons will have on future problem-solving tasks.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <i>limited</i> and/or <i>vague</i> throughout the response for Step 4.</p>	<p>A response at the 3 level provides <i>effective</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the entire process of the plan; to project changes that could be made in similar situations; and to explain lessons learned from the implementation of the plan and explain the impact that those lessons will have on future problem-solving tasks.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <i>appropriate</i> and <i>connected</i> throughout the response for Step 4.</p>	<p>A response at the 4 level provides <i>consistent</i> evidence that demonstrates the school leader candidate’s ability to reflect on the effectiveness of the entire process of the plan; to project changes that could be made in similar situations; and to explain lessons learned from the implementation of the plan and explain the impact that those lessons will have on future problem-solving tasks.</p> <p>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <i>insightful</i> and <i>thoroughly connected</i> throughout the response for Step 4.</p>
<p>For <b>textbox 1.4.1</b>, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ineffective</i> changes that could be made to the implementation</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.4.1</b>, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>limited</i> changes that could be made to the implementation</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.4.1</b>, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>coherent</i> changes that could be made to the implementation</li> </ul>	<p>For <b>textbox 1.4.1</b>, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>substantive</i> changes that could be made to the implementation</li> </ul>

<p>process used for the plan, with <i>ineffectively connected</i> examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>minimal</i> identification of the impact that the process of developing and implementing will have on future problem-solving tasks</li> </ul>	<p>process used for the plan, with <i>loosely connected</i> examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an <i>uneven</i> identification of the impact that the process of developing and implementing will have on future problem-solving tasks</li> </ul>	<p>process used for the plan, with <i>relevant</i> examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>thoughtful</i> identification of the impact that the process of developing and implementing will have on future problem-solving tasks</li> </ul>	<p>process used for the plan, with <i>thoroughly connected</i> examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <i>significant</i> identification of the impact that the process of developing and implementing will have on future problem-solving tasks</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---