
3B

Action

Professional Services Committee

Adoption of the Passing Score Standard for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides the Commission with recommendations relevant to the determination of passing score standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video.

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt the recommended passing score standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video.

Presenters: Michael Taylor and Yvonne Novelli, Consultants, 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

August 2011

Adoption of the Passing Score Standard for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Introduction

This report describes the standard setting study for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE) Written and CPACE-Video components of the CPACE examination program, and provides staff-recommended initial passing standards for each component based on the recommendations from the CPACE Standard Setting Panel.

Based on established examination development procedures, which are outlined in the August 2009 agenda item, “Examinations Development Procedures and State Contracting Processes” available at www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-08/2009-08-2D.pdf, the CPACE Content Specifications were defined and the test questions were developed. These two phases are discussed in the Background section of this agenda item.

The procedures used in the final CPACE phase, setting the passing scores, are detailed in the “The CPACE Standard Setting Studies” section of this item. The CPACE Standard Setting Panel and Commission staff recommendations on passing score standards will be provided in an agenda insert to this item due to the timing of the standard-setting activities.

Background

Education Code section 44270.5 allows an individual seeking a preliminary Administrative Services Credential to either complete a one-year Administrative Services preparation program or pass an examination, with the stipulation that the examination’s content is aligned with the Administrative Services Program Standards for preliminary certification. In either case, the individual must also hold an appropriate prerequisite credential and complete three years of teaching or other relevant experience. In 2002, the Commission approved the use of a national examination, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA #1010), to satisfy this option.

At the October 2008 meeting, the Commission reviewed the examination option and determined that it continued to be viable but felt it would better serve the California education community, including California students, if it was more reflective of California school law, finances, organization, and student population. The Commission approved the development of a California-specific examination to replace the use of the SLLA as soon as the new examination was ready for implementation.

Development of the CPACE Content Specifications

The development of the CPACE Content Specifications is detailed in the June 2010 agenda item and insert, “Adoption of Content Specifications and Domain Weighting for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)” available through www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-agenda.html. The following is a brief

overview. Initially, a CPACE Examination Development Team was established by the Commission, representing 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. Development Team members worked on the initial draft of the content specifications, making certain that they were aligned to the current Administrative Services program standards for preliminary certification and were consistent with relevant literature in the field, including the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) and the 2008 Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. The draft standards were then reviewed by nationally-known experts to determine its relevance to the national standards and established theories and then by statewide focus groups of practicing California administrators as well as administrative personnel educators to determine how well it reflected the level of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by a capable beginning administrator in California public schools. Additionally, the Commission's Bias Review Committee reviewed the draft content specifications to ensure that the content was free from issues of potential bias. Based on the comments, the Development Team revisited the draft content specifications, resulting in a more concise and better organized examination product that still maintained its alignment with the credential program standards. After a statewide content validation survey of the revised draft targeting administrators, administrative personnel educators, and school educators in non-administrative positions, the Development Team used the comments to finalize the draft CPACE Content Specifications, which were presented to the Commission for approval at their June 2010 meeting (www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-agenda.html). Appendix A represents an abbreviated version of the approved CPACE Content Specifications.

Development of the CPACE Test Items

Since then, the Development Team along with the CPACE contractor, the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, worked to develop test items to reflect those specifications. Once this was accomplished and the items were reviewed by the Bias Review Committee, the proposed CPACE-Written items were field tested by individuals with at least three years of certificated experience in California schools, such as teaching, counseling, nursing, or as librarians, but who have neither taught school administration courses nor held an Administrative Services Credential. Additionally, during field-testing, individuals with the same qualifications responded to the proposed CPACE-Video testing scenarios that an actual examinee might be asked to present. For both components, the field testing resulted in the acceptance of high quality test items and confirmed the viability of the testing formats. Sample test items are located under Test Preparation Materials at the CPACE Website, www.cpace.nesinc.com.

CPACE Test Structure

The set of administrator knowledge and skills described in the CPACE Content Specifications and reflected in the CPACE is organized into the following four domains:

- Domain I: Visionary and Inclusive Leadership
- Domain II: Student Learning
- Domain III: Systems for Capacity Building
- Domain IV: Resource Management and Educational Law

To pass the CPACE, an examinee must pass both the CPACE-Written and the CPACE-Video. The CPACE test structures for both components are located in Appendix B.

CPACE-Written

The CPACE-Written is a three-hour and forty-five minute computer-based test that consists of 70 multiple-choice items, three focused assignments (short essays), and one case study, as described below. The multiple-choice items and constructed-response assignments are distributed across the four domains of the CPACE Content Specifications approximately as follows: 20% from Domain I, 30% from Domain II, 30% from Domain III, and 20% from Domain IV.

- The multiple-choice section includes both content questions, which assess knowledge about school leadership, and contextualized questions, which assess the candidate's ability to apply specific knowledge, to analyze specific problems, or to conduct specific tasks related to educational administration. Of the 70 multiple-choice items, 60 apply to the examinee's score with the remaining ten non-scorable items included to collect performance data under actual testing conditions.
- There are three focused assignments, one for each of the Domains I, II, and IV. In each, examinees are presented with a problem or task related to a particular school and then asked to provide explanations related to appropriate strategies and considerations in addressing the problem or task. Examinees typically provide responses of 150–300 words for each focused assignment.
- The case study assignment targets knowledge and skills from Domains II and III. In this assignment, examinees receive substantial background information about a particular school and are asked to identify one school strength and two school weaknesses reflected in the information provided. They are then asked to describe a strategy for building on that strength and for addressing each weakness, with an explanation why each described strategy is likely to be effective. The case study usually results in a 300–600 word response.

Responses to multiple-choice questions are machine scored as correct or incorrect. When the number of correct answers is determined; there is no penalty for guessing. The multiple-choice section accounts for 60% of a candidate's total test score. Responses to the constructed-response assignments are scored independently by at least two qualified and well-trained California educators using standardized procedures. Using a four-point score scale, raw scores ranging from 8 to 32 may be earned by a candidate on the constructed-response section and, when the weighting is applied, may total 64 raw-weighted points. The Constructed-response items account for 40% of a candidate's total test score. The Commission will adopt a passing score based on the raw score metric. Like other Commission-owned exams, CPACE raw scores will be converted to scale scores on a standard range of 100-300, with the scaled score of 220 representing the minimum passing score as determined by the Commission. Once the Commission has adopted the minimum raw score required to pass CPACE, raw scores will be converted to scale scores and reported to examinees. Future forms of CPACE will be equated for difficulty so that a scaled passing score of 220 will represent the same level of rigor as it does on the initial operational form.

CPACE-Video

The CPACE-Video component requires the examinee to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and abilities in using effective communication skills in a professional interaction, such as facilitating a meeting. Although communication is specifically included as an example of the first competency of Domain I, the CPACE-Video addresses effective communication skills in professional interactions as described in all four domains of the CPACE Content Specifications. The holistic scoring approach used in assessing the video submissions allows reviewers to take into consideration aspects across domains in determining how well the examinee met the self-stated goals.

The examinee's communication skills are demonstrated through video submission, which includes (1) a Context Form describing the setting and expected goals of the interaction between the examinee and participants, (2) a 7 to 10 minute video of the examinee completing the required task, and (3) a Reflection Form providing a self-appraisal. The self-appraisal of the examinee's performance in addressing the task should include a description of one or more strengths the examinee displayed and one or more improvements needed in the examinee's communication skills and how the strength(s) did and improvement(s) would affect the interaction. The self-appraisal should also address the goal(s) outlined in the Context Form and explain why the examinee did or did not achieve this.

To score the CPACE-Video, two reviewers independently score the video submission. The scoring process results in two independent scores, one from each reviewer, based on a four-point scale. The total score is the sum of these two scores. Test results are reported as scaled scores. A scaled score is based on the number of raw score points earned. Raw scores, using the Commission-approved passing standard, are converted to a scale of 100 to 300, with the scaled score of 220 representing the minimum passing score, as determined by the Commission.

The CPACE Standard Setting Studies

The purpose of the standard setting studies is to provide the Commission with recommendations, based on the informed judgments of California educators, relevant to the determination of the initial passing standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video. The educators on the Commission-established CPACE Standard Setting Panel represented California site administrators, district- and county-level administrators, and administrative personnel educators, all with significant expertise and experience in school administration. The names and affiliations of the members of the CPACE Standard Setting Panel as well as aggregate information related to their demographics will be included in the agenda insert.

As with the standard setting study method used for all other Commission examinations, the process employed for both CPACE components was consistent with recognized psychometric principles and procedures. The standard setting studies for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video were conducted on July 12-13, 2011.

CPACE-Written

The CPACE standard setting meeting began with an orientation and training session. The initial step was to ask the panel members to independently take the CPACE-Written, using the June 2011 test form, under simulated test-like conditions. This helped the members become familiar

with the examination, the knowledge and skills associated with the items, and the perspective of the examinees. The panel members were then familiarized with the CPACE Content Specifications and the concept of the minimally competent beginning administrator. Panel members are asked to conceptualize the specific content knowledge and skills of a hypothetical administrator candidate who would be minimally competent as a beginning administrator. Panel members used this concept of what a minimally competent new administrator would know and be able to do in determining their recommended minimally acceptable score for passing CPACE. Although a number of examinees will exceed the level of acceptable knowledge and skills, none receiving a passing score should fall below this minimally competent level. They also reviewed the performance characteristics and score scale used to evaluate the constructed-response items in the CPACE-Written, which are provided in Appendix C. After this extensive training and the simulated test taking, panel members completed the following three rounds of standard setting ratings.

- Round One: For each multiple-choice item, the panel members were asked to independently rate the percent of minimally competent beginning administrators who would answer the item correctly. For each constructed-response item, members were asked to independently indicate the level of response that would be achieved by the minimally competent beginning administrator.
- Round Two: The Round One ratings, which were displayed anonymously, were distributed, and members discussed the reasoning used in making their determinations. This round moved the panel from individual item ratings to ratings at the section level (i.e., multiple-choice section and constructed-response section). They were asked the number of multiple-choice items that would be answered correctly and the total score points that would be achieved on the constructed-response items by the minimally competent beginning administrator.
- Round Three: Panel members were given the results of their Round Two ratings, along with information about the examinee pass rates at various panel member ratings. They were then asked to make final independent recommendations for a passing standard based on the raw score points earned on each section of the test.

The Panel's recommendation, which will be presented in the agenda insert, will represent the computed median of the third round results.

CPACE-Video

The CPACE-Video standard setting study began with a review of the CPACE Content Specifications and the concept of the minimally competent beginning administrator. The panel was then introduced to the CPACE-Video testing structure and procedures, including the information and materials examinees receive before and after registering, the required contents of the video submission, and, as found in Appendix C, the score point descriptions and expectations for the four-point score scale.

This activity led to reviews of actual pre-scored video submissions representing the various score points, in which the members reviewed the examinee's Context Form, which gave the setting and

intent of the activity. Then, after viewing the examinee's video, they reviewed the examinee's written self-assessment in the Reflection Form. The panel discussed the rationale for the scores assigned to each video submission which helped clarify the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to obtain the various scores.

The panel members applied the concept of a minimally competent beginning administrator along with their knowledge of what the individual scores represented to begin the following two-round standard setting process.

- Round One: Panel members were asked to independently consider the level of response that would be achieved by the minimally competent beginning administrator, using scores ranging from two to eight.
- Round Two: Each member's rating was disseminated to the group, again anonymously, and members discussed the various aspects they considered in determining their ratings. Then the members were given a final opportunity to revise their independent rating.

The Panel's recommendation for the CPACE-Video passing standard will represent the computed median of the second round results and be presented in the agenda insert.

Results of the Standard Setting Studies

Because of the Commission's agenda publication deadline, the CPACE Standard Setting Panel's recommended passing score standard for both the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video will be presented in an agenda insert.

Applying the Standard to the June 2011 and Future CPACE Administrations and Submissions

In the future, the CPACE-Written will be offered during three one-week windows and the CPACE-Video will have three submission deadlines each testing year. For both the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video, the passing standards adopted by the Commission will be applied to the June 2011 test results and all subsequent administrations.

Regarding those who took the June 2011 CPACE, scores for the 116 CPACE-Written and 62 CPACE-Video examinees will be distributed three to four weeks after the Commission determines the CPACE passing score standards.

Appendix A

Abbreviated CPACE Content Specifications

For the complete CPACE Content Specifications, including the extensive descriptive text for each of the ten competencies, please view the June 2010 agenda item and insert, “Adoption of Content Specifications and Domain Weighting for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)” available through www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-agenda.html.

DOMAIN I—VISIONARY AND INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP

- 0001 Understand how to provide leadership in facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared vision of learning; collaborating with diverse constituents; and mobilizing school and community resources to achieve the vision and promote the success of all student groups.
- 0002 Understand the interplay of the political, social, economic, legal, ethical, and cultural contexts of education in promoting the success of all student groups.

DOMAIN II—STUDENT LEARNING

- 0003 Understand how to advocate, nurture, and sustain a positive culture of learning that emphasizes high expectations and an instructional program that promotes success for all student groups.
- 0004 Understand effective teaching and learning and the use of instructional leadership to promote the success of all student groups.

DOMAIN III—SYSTEMS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING

- 0005 Understand how to use professional development for faculty, staff, and self to promote lifelong learning and the success of all student groups.
- 0006 Understand organizational management and its use in creating positive and productive learning systems that promote the success of all student groups.

DOMAIN IV—RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL LAW

- 0007 Understand human resource management and its use in creating a positive and productive learning system that promotes the success of all student groups.
- 0008 Understand operational management and its use in creating a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment that promotes the success of all student groups.
- 0009 Understand fiscal and material resource management and its use in creating efficient and effective learning systems that promote the success of all student groups.
- 0010 Understand the legal dimensions of educational leadership.

Appendix B

Test Structure Tables

CPACE–Written

DOMAIN	NUMBER OF COMPETENCIES	APPROXIMATE WEIGHTING	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF MULTIPLE-CHOICE ITEMS	NUMBER AND TYPE OF CONSTRUCTED-RESPONSE ITEMS	
				Focused Constructed-Response	Case Study
I: Visionary and Inclusive Leadership	2	20%	14	1	--
II: Student Learning	2	30%	16	1	1
III: Systems for Capacity Building	2	30%	26	--	
IV: Resource Management and Educational Law	4	20%	14	1	--
TOTAL	10	100%	70	3	1

CPACE–Video

DOMAINS	VIDEO SUBMISSION
I: Visionary and Inclusive Leadership	<p>A video submission includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context Form • 7 to 10-minute video-recorded task • Reflection Form <p>The video submission should demonstrate competency in using effective communication skills in a professional interaction.</p>
II: Student Learning	
III: Systems for Capacity Building	
IV: Resource Management and Educational Law	

Appendix C

CPACE Performance Characteristics and Four-Point Score Scales

CPACE-Written: Performance Characteristics and Score Scales

Performance Characteristics

Purpose: The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills by fulfilling the purpose of the assignment

Application of Content: The candidate accurately and effectively applies the relevant content knowledge and skills

Support: The candidate supports the response with appropriate examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills

SCORE	SCORE POINT DESCRIPTION
4	<p>The "4" response reflects a thorough understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response completely fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding fully to the given task. • The response demonstrates an accurate and effective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains. • The response provides strong supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.
3	<p>The "3" response reflects an adequate understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response generally fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding adequately to the given task. • The response demonstrates a generally accurate and reasonably effective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains. • The response provides adequate supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.
2	<p>The "2" response reflects a limited understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response partially fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding in a limited way to the given task. • The response demonstrates a limited and generally ineffective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains and may contain significant inaccuracies. • The response provides limited supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.
1	<p>The "1" response reflects little or no understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response fails to fulfill the purpose of the assignment by responding inadequately to the given task. • The response demonstrates a largely inaccurate and/or ineffective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains. • The response provides little or no supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.

CPACE-Video: Performance Characteristics and Score Scales

SCORE	SCORE POINT DESCRIPTION	
4	The “4” response thoroughly fulfills the following expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan an interaction that demonstrates your understanding of how to use effective communication skills in a professional setting. • Plan an interaction that is appropriate to the context in which the communication occurs.
3	The “3” response satisfactorily fulfills the following expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan an interaction that addresses the goal(s) you have for the communication. • Engage in an authentic interaction in which you communicate clearly and accurately within the context of the professional setting. • Engage in an authentic interaction in which you demonstrate oral communication skills appropriate to the professional setting.
2	The “2” response only partially fulfills the following expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in an authentic interaction in which you demonstrate nonverbal communication skills appropriate to the professional setting. • Engage in an authentic interaction in which you demonstrate presentation skills appropriate to the professional setting.
1	The “1” response fails to fulfill the following expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze how your communication skills affected the interaction. • Reflect on how you could have improved your communication skills to enhance the effectiveness of the interaction. • Evaluate the extent to which you achieved your goal(s) for the communication.