

Welcome to a series of six presentations on the GACE Teacher Leadership Assessment. Each presentation will begin with an overview of the six Teacher Leadership tasks and then a deep dive into one task in particular. This presentation focuses on Task 6.



The purpose of this session is to better understand the components of Task 6 and to understand the evidence that is needed to successfully create responses to the guiding prompts.



This slide presents the purpose of the assessment and includes the Tasks that comprise the assessment.



When the Tasks were first developed, the understanding was that the adult learning strategies (ALS) permeated all the Tasks. Teacher Leader candidates work with colleagues to support **their** growth as professionals using the adult learning strategies. Look at the verbs "guide," and "facilitate" on these slides. These actions are the primary focus of the Tasks. These concepts will be enforced throughout the presentations.

However, even though ALS permeate all the Tasks, we will evaluate them in only one Task and focus on how they are applied in the other five Tasks.

Because these strategies are such an integral part of this assessment, you might suggest to the candidates that they begin with Task 1 and then move on in any order they wish.



Look at the verbs "involve," "facilitate," and "advance," on this slide. Candidates work with colleagues to support **their** growth as professionals and these actions are the primary focus of the Tasks.



Look at the verbs "improve," "build," and "promote" and on this slide. Candidates work with colleagues to support **their** growth as professionals and these actions are the primary focus of the Tasks.



The main idea of this graphic is to show candidates that their submissions for each of the six tasks must demonstrate their facilitation in working with their colleagues to enhance those colleagues' skills in research, professional learning, improvement of instruction, outreach to families and community, and in advocacy. Notice the arrow that stretches between the candidate and the listing of skills. The arrow is a negative. This assessment is not about the candidates' ability to research, advocate, etc. It is about how candidates improve the research and advocacy skills of their colleagues.



It has been our experience that talking about their own skills is the single most common problem candidates have. Because these Task are based on the candidates' ability to facilitate the growth of others, candidates need to keep reminding themselves of their purpose by asking the questions on this slide.



Artifacts are an integral part of candidates' responses. The next slide offers an explanation of their function.



Within the task's appropriate textboxes, candidates are again directed to attach the clearly identified artifact. Artifacts can be referenced anywhere in the response, but must be attached once and only once in the specified textbox.



Please note the last bullet. Page two of each of the Tasks contains a chart that identifies where in the response an artifact is to be linked.



Let's take a look at the details of Task 6: Collaborative Teams and Advocacy. This task focuses on candidates' abilities to develop and support a collaborative team to improve practice.



For Task 6, we adapted this key question for candidates to consider when organizing a team: "How can I develop and support a collaborative team with my colleagues? Also to consider, "What are the best adult learning strategies for promoting collegial interactions with my colleagues?"



Task 6 is all about the Teacher Leader **building and facilitating a collaborative team** that will promote opportunities for **educational improvement through advocacy** as well as **promote collegial interactions** and **improvement of professional practice**.





There is a dual focus: (1) The advocacy plan for educational improvement, and (2) supporting a team to build collegial interactions and improve professional practice.

For this task, we are looking for the Teacher Leader to demonstrate, in the context of an advocacy plan, **leadership strategies** in a collaborative effort with his or her colleagues.



Before any of the Task 6 raters score this task, they are exposed to what advocacy means and what it looks like in the context of Task 6.

Here are the definitions for "advocacy" and "advocate" from the Teacher Leadership Glossary of Terms. These definitions help shape the context and form an expectation for our Raters while they score responses. So, as you can see, advocacy goes way beyond a team project.

Required Artifacts	Maximum Number of Pages	Textbox Location
Advocacy Plan	1	6.1.1
Professional growth evaluation from a minimum of two colleagues involved in the advocacy plan <ul> <li>The evaluation can be, but is not limited to:         <ul> <li>a survey form completed by involved colleagues;</li> <li>a written response from an involved colleague; or</li> <li>a chart created by a group of involved colleagues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3	6.3.1
Stakeholder feedback           • The feedback can come from either of the following sources:         o           o         communication showing interactions between colleagues and stakeholders; or           o         print media showing involvement with advocacy efforts.	2	6.3.1

There are three artifacts required for this task.

The first required artifact is the advocacy plan. Based on the definition of advocacy, this plan must reflect those components. The Teacher Leadership candidate needs to know exactly what is going to be asked of him or her in the guiding prompts for the four textboxes within this task. For example, Textbox 6.1.1's title is "The Plan," and it requires a candidate to attach and describe the advocacy plan and its relevance to the educational system and student learning. In Textbox 6.1.2 we are looking for a connection to that plan, and the title of Textbox 6.2.1 is "Advocacy," so those prompts require the candidate to refer to the plan's procedures and activities. So it is very important that the candidate submits an advocacy plan and that the plan's contents are connected to what is in his or her written commentary.

The second required artifact for Task 6 is based on the professional growth of the team members. Since this task required the candidate to promote colleagues' professional growth, there must be a way to know whether he or she was successful. This is demonstrated through the professional growth evaluation of at least two colleagues. This means that the candidate must evaluate and obtain feedback from the colleagues. Some

suggestions for that feedback are listed in the artifact chart. The impact of this evaluation will be evident in the guiding prompts in Textbox 6.3.1.

The third required artifact includes stakeholders' feedback. Since stakeholders are a vital part of advocacy, it is imperative that their feedback is elicited either during the implementation of the advocacy project or after the completion of the advocacy project. The artifact chart contains a few examples of sources a candidate can use. This artifact is also attached in textbox 6.3.1.

For all of the artifacts, the candidate must remember to always connect the contents of the artifacts to the written commentary.





The vehicle for this task, in which the Teacher Leader must demonstrate his or her leadership skills, is the **advocacy plan**. In many cases, we have seen a candidate choose an educational improvement or project with his or her team members that they have decided to work on together or a situation in which the candidate is already a member of a PLC that is working on a project. Both of these examples are NOT considered advocacy. Some of the previously submitted responses listed projects that the candidate participated in as a team member but did not show how the candidate facilitated an advocacy plan with colleagues.

Candidates must be very careful that this task focuses on advocacy and not just professional development.

While this textbox does not receive a score, it is the place where a candidate describes the needs assessment that he or she, along with the colleagues, used to identify an educational improvement and student learning opportunities for which the candidate and colleagues could advocate.



The purpose of Step 1 is for candidates to demonstrate their facilitation skills by applying adult-learning strategies to identify and assess opportunities for educational improvement by advocating for those improvements while supporting colleagues professional growth.

This Step contains two textboxes. Candidates should keep in mind that Step 1 will receive a score.



Textbox 6.1.1's Guiding Prompt A requires three things. First is that the entire collaborative team **had a say** in selecting the educational improvement. Often we have submissions in which the candidate selected the improvement without any input from the team. Second, the description of the advocacy plan also should be developed by the **team**. When a candidate describes the team's plan, it is important to include the relevance of the advocacy plan to the educational system as well as to student learning.

For Guiding Prompt B, in previous submissions, candidates did not address, or just glazed over in a cursory manner, the educational policies and trends that influenced the team's work on this plan. This prompt requires candidates to talk about whether the policy/trend was a catalyst or if there are educational policies/trends that the team needs to be aware of that could affect the work during the implementation of the plan. A strong response for 6.1.1 provides specific examples.



This textbox focuses on the team that the candidate selected and how the candidate will facilitate that team with leadership skills and strategies.

In Guiding Prompt A, many previous candidates created a list of the team members but did not provide a rational for why each one was selected. This is a two part prompt that asks for a rationale for the selection of **each** of the team members.

In Guiding Prompt B, if previous candidates presented specific leadership strategies and skills, they frequently did not connect the rationale as to why they were selected and used to build a collaborative team. In fact, many of the previous candidates failed to mention any leadership strategies and skills.

As an example, a candidate could use selection strategies, such as choosing someone who is task oriented, someone who is positive, or someone who is known to be a collaborative person. The candidate could also state what role each member played on the team.

For Guiding Prompt C, the plan should not have been previously developed by the

candidate in isolation and then placed before the team. Nor should the candidate's comment describe the plan but fail to mention the methods, skills, and procedures used to facilitate the team's development of the plan. This prompt is giving the candidate the chance to demonstrated adult-learning strategies and skills that helped the colleagues to contribute to the plan's development.

For Guiding Prompt D, the candidate must demonstrate an understanding of how educational policy can affect the advocacy plan by sharing educational policy with the team members. In previous responses, the candidates spoke to the policy but did not explain how the candidate promoted the team's understanding of educational policy.

For Guiding Prompt E, many of the previous responses contained lists of resources but failed to explain how the resources were made available to the team. Remember, a strong response provides examples to support the selections made.

Remember, for this assessment, a candidate must demonstrate the ability to facilitate professional learning for his or her colleagues.



The purpose of Step 2 is for candidates to demonstrate their facilitation skills by applying adult-learning strategies to collaboratively implement the procedures of the advocacy plan. There is one textbox in this Step.

Textbox 6.2.1 separates the procedures from the activities. Guiding Prompt A requires candidates to describe the strategic procedures implemented by the team to advocate for a selected educational improvement. For example, a candidate should comment on what needed to happen, how the team went about achieving the change, and how the team sequenced the implementation of the activities to achieve the most desired result. In other words, the candidate needs to describe the key steps that the team took in order to reach the vision and meet the goals and objectives of the advocacy plan.

For Guiding Prompt B, the candidate can describe the range of activities used by the team to involve stakeholders and to affect the educational system and student learning. All of the tasks require candidates to consider how their choices will affect the educational system and student learning. This is why multiple examples are necessary to illustrate the effectiveness of the activities.



The purpose of Step 3 is for candidates to demonstrate their facilitation skills by applying adult-learning strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of the advocacy plan and the professional growth of the team. There is one textbox in this Step.



For Textbox 6.3.1's Guiding Prompt A, the candidate needs to address two areas: the means to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan and the means to evaluate the professional growth of the team. There is also an artifact that needs to be attached here in 6.3.1, the professional growth evaluation from a minimum of two colleagues with whom the candidate worked. Both areas of this prompt need to be obvious in the written commentary.

In Guiding Prompt B, raters look for three different areas of evidence: First, the candidate's analysis of the effectiveness of the advocacy plan as well as the effectiveness of the collaboration that happened during implementation. Also in this prompt, candidates must relate the effectiveness in speaking to how it enhanced the professional practice of colleagues **and** student learning. Many previous candidates failed to address all of the key areas of this prompt.

For Guiding Prompt C, remember that one of the required artifacts to be attached in this textbox is stakeholder feedback. In previous responses, candidates described the stakeholders' feedback but failed to provide a strong connection for how the feedback affected the implementation <u>or</u> the outcome of the advocacy plan. The written

commentary **must** connect to this required artifact.

Guiding Prompt D is a two-part prompt. In order for a candidate to meet the standards, based on the rubric, the candidate must be able to explain how he or she affected collegial interactions and his or her colleagues' practice. Again, the focus of this assessment is for a teacher leader to enhance colleagues' professional growth.

Guiding Prompt E has two parts. The candidate is required to explain the impact of the plan on future advocacy work within the school **and** how this advocacy work might have an impact within the district.



Now to summarize the important aspects candidates need to keep in mind when working with any of the six tasks for GACE Teacher Leadership.



Based on our experiences with scoring these responses, we would like to emphasize a few things.

Candidates need to keep in mind the essence of each task. The Teacher Leadership assessment provides a meaningful measure of a teacher leader candidate's readiness and ability to provide effective instructional leadership. This is paramount when planning, executing, and responding to the tasks. Demonstration of these teacher leadership skills needs to be in the forefront when discussing the responses to the guiding prompts.

Facilitation. These six Teacher Leadership tasks are not designed to see how well candidates, for example, can do research or advocate. They are designed for candidates to demonstrate their abilities to facilitate, model, and support and lead others.

As candidates respond to each of the guiding prompts, a good idea is for them to label each guiding prompt "a," "b," "c," etc. in their response to help determine whether each has been addressed.

Also make sure a rationale is provided when the prompt requires one. Rationales are part of the scoring rubric, so raters expect to see that rationale in the response.



Here are some extra pointers on what to avoid when constructing responses.

1. Candidates need to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities as an effective Teacher Leader. The emphasis is on the word "leader." As stated earlier, this assessment is not for candidates to demonstrate, for example, how well they can do research; but how they can improve their colleagues' abilities to do research that will improve their practice. Keep in mind the language of the Teacher Leader standards. Raters are looking for evidence that candidates are leaders and can guide, facilitate, mentor, and help colleagues to improve their practice and student learning.

2. Candidates need to avoid providing vague responses to guiding prompts. Commentaries written in generic or general terms do not effectively communicate the activities performed as Teacher Leaders. Candidates need to be specific in each sentence they write to make it clear of the leadership skills they are providing colleagues. For example, one candidate included this statement in a response regarding guiding colleagues through the decision-making process: "It was agreed that further research on the matter of effectively implementing the new model would be beneficial to teachers and students." This response is inadequate because it offers no detail on what kind of additional research should be performed or how and why that research would benefit teachers and students. Candidates need to be specific in each sentence they write to give the rater a clear picture of the

leadership provided to colleagues and the processes the team followed.

Descriptions of strategies that don't address the prompts is something else to avoid. Candidates often cite adult learning strategies without saying how they actually use the strategies in their own practice. Examples of adult learning strategies you employ need to be specific and closely connected to the task at hand.



It is extremely helpful for candidates to look at Library of Examples located on the GACE website for some examples. There are two examples for each textbox within a task. One example contains more evidence than the other. Both help in understanding the wording of the rubric. Candidates can match the evidence from the response to the specific wording of the rubric. What makes one example appropriate or effective and another vague or limited? Examination and discussion based on these responses can be helpful for candidates as they create their own commentary.

The Library of Examples can be an effective tool in helping candidates see what they can and are doing. They are especially effective when used in group discussions.