
5C

Action

Professional Services Committee

Adoption of Content Specifications and Domain Weighting for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Executive Summary: This item provides the recommended content specifications and domain weighting for the CPACE examination for the Commission's final review and describes the next steps in the CPACE development process.

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt the recommended CPACE Content Specifications and domain weighting.

Presenter: Yvonne Novelli, Consultant, and Larry Birch, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs
- ◆ Conduct, monitor, and evaluate the programs and systems the Commission operates to maintain quality and assure the systems align with each other and other state systems

June 2010

Adoption of Content Specifications and Domain Weighting for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Introduction

Content specifications describe the range of content eligible for inclusion in a given examination, while the domain weighting determines the proportion of the examination devoted to assessing specific knowledge. This item presents the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE) Content Specifications and domain weighting recommended by the CPACE Examination Development Team. This item also describes the process used for drafting and validating the CPACE Content Specifications and indicates the next steps in the ongoing CPACE development process.

Background

An individual seeking a preliminary Administrative Services Credential needs to (1) hold an appropriate prerequisite credential, (2) complete three years teaching or other relevant experience, (3) have an offer of employment in an administrative position, and (4) per Education Code section 44270.5, complete either an Administrative Services preparation program or an examination alternative that is aligned with the Administrative Services program standards for preliminary certification. With the implementation of this statute in 2002, the Commission initially approved the use of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) from Educational Testing Service to meet the examination option. In October 2008, the Commission approved the continued use of the examination option and directed staff to develop a California-specific examination that included a focus on California school law, finances, organization, and English learner issues. Following the bidding process, the contract to develop and administer the CPACE examination program was awarded to Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (Evaluation Systems).

Development of the Draft CPACE Content Specifications

The process followed to develop the initial draft CPACE Content Specifications was described in detail in the April 2010 information agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-04/2010-04-3E.pdf>). The final step in developing the draft CPACE Content Specifications was a statewide survey of stakeholders. Both steps are described below.

Summary of the Initial Steps in Establishing the CPACE Content Specifications

The CPACE Examination Development Team, established by the Commission, is composed of individuals with a complex knowledge of and/or exemplary experience in California public school administration. They represent teaching staff, elementary and secondary site administrators, district- and county-level administrators, and administrative personnel educators from the California State University system, private institutions of higher education, and alternative route programs. The Development Team members are listed in Appendix A.

As required in statute, the draft of the CPACE Content Specifications was aligned to the current Administrative Services program standards for preliminary certification, as outlined in Appendix B. This draft, after an initial review by the Development Team, was compared for consistency to relevant literature in the field, including the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) and the 2008 Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. Next, five nationally-known experts reviewed the draft to determine its relevance to the national standards and established theories in the field of school administration. Following the expert review, focus groups of practicing site, district, and county California administrators as well as some administrative personnel educators reviewed the draft. The groups focused on how well the draft reflected the level of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by a capable novice administrator in California public schools. Subsequently the Commission's Bias Review Committee reviewed the draft content specifications to ensure that the content was free from issues of bias.

Based on the comments from the national experts, focus groups, and Bias Review Committee, in addition to their own expertise, the CPACE Examination Development Team revisited the draft CPACE Content Specifications. Their work resulted in a more concise and better organized examination product that still maintained its alignment with the credential program standards.

Statewide Content Validation Survey of the Revised Draft Content Specifications

Since the April 2010 Commission meeting, Evaluation Systems has completed the statewide survey to determine if California educators consider the latest draft CPACE Content Specifications valid for the work performed by the holder of a preliminary Administrative Services Credential. This survey targeted three main groups of California educators: administrators, administrative personnel educators, and school educators in non-administrative positions. Their responses aided the Development Team in refining the recommended draft CPACE Content Specifications being presented to the Commission for adoption.

With the assistance of California employers, institutions, and teacher unions, Evaluation Systems distributed this survey to over 8000 educators reflecting the state's ethnic diversity, school population areas (urban, suburban, and rural), and school types (preschool, elementary, middle school, secondary, and adult education). Prior to opening the survey period, Evaluation Systems requested the superintendent of every district and county office of education as well as the dean of education and, for alternative certification programs, the program directors of each institution with an approved Administrative Services Credential program to encourage their staff to complete the survey. They also contacted the California Teachers Association (CTA) and the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), requesting that they assist in advertising the availability of this survey to their public school members in non-administrative positions. Thus, invitations to participate in the statewide survey were initially distributed to the following:

- Every district and county administrator identified in the California Department of Education's database, the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS).
- Each administrative personnel educator in Commission-accredited Administrative Services Credential programs whose email was available from the institution's website

or, when these websites did not include this information, those identified by their dean or program director.

- Numerous certificated school educators in non-administrative positions as identified by the presidents of CTA and CFT and their respective Commission liaisons.

Because of the initial low number of survey responses, Evaluation Systems intensified the recruitment effort by sending follow-up emails and making numerous phone calls to potential responders. The Professional Services Division also sent a reminder via its list serve, requesting individuals to complete the survey. The survey period was extended for one additional week, and the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) aided the Commission in soliciting survey responses. These efforts resulted in a total of 1,078 administrators, 6 administrative personnel educators, and 27 school educators in non-administrative positions responding to the survey.

The survey asked individuals to respond to the various aspects of the CPACE Content Specifications, including the importance of each of the ten competencies that are the bases for the four domains and the relevance of the respective sets of descriptive statements that further clarify the competencies. They were also asked to respond to the content specifications as a whole. The following lists the specific questions with their respective rating scale range:

- With respect to the individual competencies: *“How important are the knowledge, skills, and abilities described by the competency below for acceptably performing the job of an entry-level administrator in California?”* Rating scale: one = "no importance" to five = "very great importance."
- With respect to the set of descriptive statements: *“How well does the set of descriptive statements below represent important examples of the knowledge, skills, and abilities addressed by the competency?”* Rating scale: one = "poorly" to five = "very well."
- With respect to the competencies as a whole: *“How well does the set of competencies, as a whole, represent important aspects of the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for acceptably performing the job of an entry-level administrator in California?”* Rating scale: one = "poorly" to five = "very well."

In addition to the three specific survey questions, the respondents were also given an opportunity to provide feedback about the draft CPACE Content Specifications, particularly for any low ratings they may have given. The comments received included: “the competencies are all important,” “this framework looks like it does a good job of addressing necessary competencies,” and “these look quite comprehensive.”

Final Draft CPACE Content Specifications for Commission Adoption

The CPACE Examination Development Team will meet before the June 2010 Commission meeting to review the results of the survey and make any appropriate modifications to the draft CPACE Content Specifications previously presented at the April 2010 Commission meeting. Because of the close timing between this activity and the agenda deadline for the June 2010

Commission meeting, the final draft version of the CPACE Content Specifications for the Commission's approval will be provided in an agenda insert. However, the preliminary analysis of the survey responses shows support for the CPACE Content Specifications with only minimal suggestions for wording changes. The agenda insert will provide the original CPACE Content Specifications as presented at the April 2010 Commission meeting showing any changes delineated with a strikethrough for deleted wording and underlining for new wording, thereby making any changes readily apparent.

Domain Weighting within the CPACE Examination of the Content Knowledge Identified in the CPACE Content Specifications

The draft CPACE Content Specifications as presented in the agenda insert represent 100% of the knowledge eligible to be assessed on the CPACE examination. Prior to the June 2010 Commission meeting, the Development Team reviewed the draft CPACE Content Specifications and recommended a percentage, or weight, for each of the domains. The weight assigned to each domain will determine the proportion of the CPACE examination that will be devoted to assessing that content. Again because of the close timing between this activity and the agenda deadline for the June 2010 Commission meeting, the Development Team's recommended domain weighting will be provided in the agenda insert.

Next Steps in the Development of the CPACE Examination

If the Commission adopts the CPACE Content Specifications and the domain weighting, the standard Commission process for examination development will continue based on the adopted content specifications. This process includes: (1) clarifying the specific test format, including the scoring structure and the types and number of test items; (2) developing a CPACE item bank which allows sufficient operational items for testing through Spring 2014; and (3) conducting a standard setting study to help determine a recommended minimum passing score based on the initial CPACE administration in Spring 2011. The recommended passing score standard will be brought to the Commission for adoption following the initial CPACE administration.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends adoption of the draft CPACE Content Specifications and the weighting for the CPACE examination domains as presented in the agenda insert.

Appendix A

Members of the CPACE Examination Development Team

Member	Related Experience (based on the 2009 application submitted)
Michael Babb	Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Continuous Improvement - Ventura County Office of Education Lecturer, Educational Leadership Program - California State University, Channel Islands
Nancy Brownell	Director, District/County Intervention Collaborative - California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Jeanie Cash	Assistant Superintendent - Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District <i>(Ms. Cash was unable to attend after the first meeting because of increased work obligations.)</i>
Lisette Estrella-Henderson	Assistant Superintendent - Solano County Office of Education
Don Holder	Assistant Superintendent - Fresno County Office of Education
Charmaine Kawaguchi	Computer Science and Mathematics Teacher - James Logan High School, New Haven Unified School District President - New Haven Teachers Association
Carol Leighty	Superintendent - Temecula Valley Unified School District
Sandra Ramos Miller	Professional Development Consultant - Technology Information Center for Administrative Leadership (TICAL) and Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Luis Rodriguez Cazares	Assistant Principal - North Hollywood High School, Los Angeles Unified School District
Susan Rodkin	Principal - McNear Elementary School, Petaluma City Schools
Michael Bossi	Director of Leadership Coaching - Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Stephen Davis	Educational Administration Professor and Director of Great Leaders for Great Schools Institute - California State Polytechnic University Pomona
Deborah Erickson	Assistant Dean, School of Education - California Lutheran University
Marilyn Korostoff	Professor; Co-Director Educational Leadership Doctoral Program; Coordinator of Masters and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program - California State University, Long Beach
Ronald Leon	Associate Professor, Educational Leadership - California State Polytechnic University Pomona Educational Consultant - Springboard Schools, San Francisco Executive Coach and Coordinator of Staff Development - Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) Region XV
Wayne Padover	Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Administration - National University
Suzanne Power	Systemwide Director of Educational Leadership Program and Assistant Professor - Alliant International University

Appendix B

Outline of the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs Updated August 2009

The following is an outline of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs*. For the complete standards, see <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook.doc> on the Commission website.

Preconditions for the Approval of Administrative Services Credential Programs

- General Preconditions Established by the Commission
- General Preconditions Established by State Law
- Specific Preconditions for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs Established in State Law for Internship Programs
- Specific Preconditions Established by the Commission for Internship Programs

Preliminary Credential Program Standards

Category I: Program Design, Coordination, and Curriculum

- Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design
- Standard 2: Program Coordination
- Standard 3: Development of Professional Perspectives
- Standard 4: Equity, Diversity, and Access
- Standard 5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society
- Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership

Category II: Field Experiences in the Standards

- Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences
- Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback

Category III Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

- Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
- Standard 10: Vision of Learning
- Standard 11: Student Learning and Professional Growth
- Standard 12: Organizational Management for Student Learning
- Standard 13: Working with Diverse Families and Communities
- Standard 14: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity
- Standard 15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Understanding