



GACE® Teacher Leadership Assessment

Library of Examples

Task 4, Step 1: Pre-observation

Textbox 4.1.1: Pre-observation

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 4.1.1 as excerpted from the portfolios of two different candidates. The candidate responses were not corrected or changed from what was submitted. One response was scored at the Met/Exceeded Standards Level (3-4), and the other response was scored at the Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level (1-2). This information is being provided for illustrative purposes only. These excerpts are not templates for candidates to use to guarantee a successful score. Rather, they are examples that candidates can use for comparison purposes to see the kinds of evidence that they may need to add to their own work.

Guiding Prompts Textbox 4.1.1

- a. What steps did you take to plan for the pre-observation meeting(s) with this colleague?
- b. During this meeting, how did you help the colleague collect, analyze, and apply data to determine area(s) of focus for the lesson?
- c. How did you support the colleague's selection and inclusion of multiple assessments and other data-collecting tools? How were these choices aligned with the goals of the lesson as well as with the state and local standards?
- d. What feedback did you give at the pre-observation meeting(s) concerning the colleague's proposed lesson design?
- e. What strategies of reflective practice did you model?

Example: Met/Exceeded Standards Level (3-4)

- a. In order to set up the pre-observation I first approached the idea through my lesson plan feedback I provide weekly for teachers. In her lessons, the teacher seemed to be hitting standards on a pretty basic level without addressing the rigor and deeper thinking throughout the reading process. I researched some materials that I thought might help her and I outlined some ideas that I really wanted to discuss with her. The outline would at least give me some ideas to reference.
- b. In our correspondence over lesson plans and in informal settings this teacher had expressed her observation that most of her students were too concerned with phonetic aspects of reading and were missing out on meaning. Although she credited herself as part of the problem, I used this information to open the door for this task. We looked at some test results, but more importantly, the colleague brought to the conference student work which she had been collecting. We examined the work and the questions that prompted the work. We both agreed that the responses were fairly weak. We also discussed the fact that there was no rubric connected to the assignments.

Example: Met/Exceeded Standards Level (cont'd.)

- c. Looking through the pacing guide and reflecting back on past lessons, we selected an upcoming introduction of new text. Her hope was to engage students as active thinkers throughout the lesson. I anchored on this thinking and began to push in order to support her need to grow in the context of English language development. To help foster this and bring in the use of formal assessment tools, I added in the language component to the plan through the structure of sentence frames. This conversation was conducted using learning focused structures with paraphrasing as a way to rephrase her thinking and plant seeds of growth. For example, when the teacher stated she wanted kids to be engaged in deep thinking while reading the text, I restated, "You are wanting students to think critically about text through explicit structures while you read." I obviously added the component of structures which was a way to validate her focus and quickly move to a consultancy stance to pull in the concept of frames for ESL students. These frames fit well with the colleague's goals for her students and gave her a guide as she began creating her plan.
- d. In order to bring in the assessment component we looked at the state ESL students as they related to speaking. The general focus was on grammar and the state rubric was used as the assessment tool through the observation. Comments that I mad above were part of the feedback I offered. I also reinforced the ned for the colleague to develop her own rubric to match the specifics of the activities which in turn reflected the goals of the lesson plan. I tried to make sure that the colleague's plan reflected what she wanted: more critical thinking, more rigor.
- e. Both the teacher and I had the state rubric in hand during the observation so notes to determine results could be compared afterward and language acquisition discussions could develop. As much as possible, as mentioned above, I asked questions both to clarify her thinking and to channel her plan to match the goals she herself set.

Refer to the Task 4 Rubric and ask yourself:

In the candidate's analysis, where is there evidence of the following?

- Steps taken to plan for the pre-observation meeting with the colleague
- How help was provided to the colleague to collect, analyze, and apply data to determine an area or areas of focus for the lesson
- Support provided regarding the selection and inclusion of multiple assessments and other data-collecting tools
- How the colleague's selections of multiple assessments and other data-collecting tools were aligned with the goals of the lesson and state and local standards
- Feedback offered at the pre-observation meeting concerning the colleague's proposed lesson design
- Reflective practice strategies modeled for the colleague

Why is the candidate's response **logical** or **informed**, even **significant**?

Example: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level (1-2)

In order to adequately observe my colleague I first sat down and we discussed the creation of the lesson plan. We looked at the school improvement plan, standards, and what the learning outcomes would be. After brainstorming we wrote the lesson outline and I observed a rehearsal of the lesson. This allowed my colleague to get positive and negative criticism that improved how the lesson was taught. My suggestions included using an oral and written assessment to achieve maximum learning potential. After the rehearsal we both reflected on our experience both teaching and observing. We listed our comments and concerns after both of us were done making our lists.

Refer to the Task 4 Rubric and ask yourself:

In the candidate's analysis, where is there evidence of the following?

- Steps taken to plan for the pre-observation meeting with the colleague
- How help was provided to the colleague to collect, analyze, and apply data to determine an area or areas of focus for the lesson
- Support provided regarding the selection and inclusion of multiple assessments and other data-collecting tools
- How the colleague's selections of multiple assessments and other data-collecting tools were aligned with the goals of the lesson and state and local standards
- Feedback offered at the pre-observation meeting concerning the colleague's proposed lesson design
- Reflective practice strategies modeled for the colleague

Why is the candidate's response ***partial*** or ***confusing***, even ***minimal***?

Suggestions for Using These Examples

After writing your own rough draft response to the guiding prompts, ask the question, "Which parts of these examples are closest to what I have written?" Then read the 4 levels of the matching rubric (labeled with the textbox number) and decide which best matches your response. Use this information as you revise your own written commentary.

Lastly, using your work and/or these examples as reference, consider what you believe would be appropriate artifacts for this textbox.