Missouri School Leader Performance Assessment (MoSLPA)

Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team

Rubric

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

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

Missouri Educator
Gateway Assessments

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following.	For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 4 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	• 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	• 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	• 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)			
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 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;	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 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;	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 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	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 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

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

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.	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.	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.	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 *thoroughly connected* throughout the response for Step 2.
For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following: • the *inadequate* 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 • the targeting of an *inappropriate* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *inappropriate* steps selected to measure the intended impact and an *inconsistent* rationale	For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following: • the *weak* 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 • the targeting of a *narrow* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *weak* steps selected to measure the intended impact and a *weak* rationale	For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following: • 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 • the targeting of an *appropriate* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *appropriate* steps selected to measure the intended impact and an *appropriate* rationale	For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following: • the *highly effective* 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 *thoroughly connected* rationale • the targeting of a *significant* area of research-based instructional practice to improve student learning, with *significant* steps selected to measure the intended impact and a *thorough* rationale

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4
• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

• *incomplete* resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that *minimally* supports the actions • *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	• *inconsistent* resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that *vaguely* supports the actions • *uneven* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that *lack detail* supporting the identified steps	• *thoughtful* resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that *appropriately* supports the actions • *detailed* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that *appropriately* support the identified steps	• *in-depth* resolutions of challenges encountered during the planning, with a rationale that *extensively* supports the actions • *numerous* steps taken to reach consensus among members of the team while creating the plan, with examples that *thoroughly* support the identified steps

Missouri Educator
Gateway Assessments

Step 3: Implementing the Plan (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 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. The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective*	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. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague*	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. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected*	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. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *thoroughly*

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.	throughout the response for Step 3.	throughout the response for Step 3.	*connected* throughout the response for Step 3.
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

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

• *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*

Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments

Step 4: Reflecting on the Collaborative Team (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 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.	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 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.	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 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.	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 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 *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 *thoroughly connected* throughout the response for Step 4.

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:	For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 4 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 *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	• 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	• 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
• a *minimal* evaluation of the team members' professional growth as partners in the collaborative team, with examples from the video that *ineffectively* 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	• 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	• 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
• *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	• *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	• *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	• *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 *insightfully* 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	• a *limited* 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	• 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	• 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

MoSLPA Task 3: Creating a Collaborative Team — Rubric

the plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are *disconnected*	plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are *loosely connected*	the plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are *effectively linked*	plan, the artifacts, and/or the video that are *thoroughly connected*