
2D

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Continuation of the Discussion of Examination Options relating to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Executive Summary: This agenda item continues and broadens the discussion of the purpose, role, and type of examinations within the school administrator preparation and credentialing processes and presents information and options for the Commission's further consideration.

Policy Question: This agenda item raises several policy issues for Commission review and potential direction. Does the Commission wish to pursue the discussion of any of the options presented and/or to address any of the options and issues raised in the agenda item?

Recommended Action: Staff requests that the Commission provide direction regarding any future activity in the area of examinations related to the administrative services credential.

Presenters: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, and Mike Taylor, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality

- ◆ Maintain expectations for educator preparedness and performance that are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population and promote 21st century teaching and learning.
- ◆ Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

September 2012

Continuation of the Discussion of Examination Options relating to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Introduction

This agenda item continues the discussion begun at the August 2012 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-08/2012-08-4B.pdf>) and responds to the Commission's request for further information about a number of issues relating to the purpose and types of assessment within the administrative services preparation and credentialing processes. The item also present several policy options for Commission consideration regarding additional potential roles and uses of examinations within the continuum of administrator preparation.

Background

Examinations are used by many states as part of administrative services licensing requirements. For the most part, an examination serves as a requirement for candidates who are also completing a preparation program. In some states, an examination is required for alternative route candidates but not for traditional route candidates; in other states a master's degree is required instead or in addition to an examination. California is the only state that uses an examination as an alternative route; this approach is identified by the Education Code as an "expedited" (i.e., alternative) route to the credential. In a few states, no licensure examination per se is required. Appendix A provides an overview of states' approaches to the use of examinations in their administrator licensing systems.

For states that use an examination for any school administrator licensure purpose, there have been two main approaches to assessment development and administration. Many states use an assessment initially developed by or with the assistance of one of two national contractors, Educational Testing Service (ETS) or Pearson, and subsequently administered through the contractor. A few states have developed an assessment with the assistance of a contractor, but administer the assessment themselves rather than through the contractor (i.e., Connecticut). One state, Massachusetts, issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) recently for the development of a state performance assessment for administrative candidates. Further information about these types of assessments as used in the nation is provided below.

Part I: Review and Discussion of Administrator Credentialing Examinations

Design and Implementation Characteristics of Examinations Used in the Nation for Initial Administrator Assessment

All current administrator licensure examinations, regardless of format, are anchored in a set of standards or related contextual statements, principles, or beliefs about what a beginning administrator needs to know and/or be able to do. However, there are four key characteristics in the design and implementation of these examinations for initial administrative candidate

licensure, regardless of the location and/or timing of that examination within the credentialing process.

Two key characteristics concern the ***purpose of the assessment***, and, as a result of defining the purpose of the assessment, the ***range of content, including the set of standards, covered by the assessment***. Purposes of assessment can include:

- to verify entry-level knowledge, skills and/or abilities to ensure no harm to students (for example, the CSET subject matter examinations for teacher candidates)
- to verify second tier-level knowledge, skills and/or abilities to clear the credential (used by other states)
- as a capstone to verify knowledge of program coursework (for example, the RICA)
- as a capstone to verify the candidate's ability to apply on the job the specified set of knowledge, skills, and abilities

It is important to note that the content of any given test is validated for the specific purpose to which the test results will be applicable.

With respect to the range of content, all states have some type of standards for the preparation of administrators, whether these are national standards, state-developed standards, or a combination of both. Within that array of standards, some states want an examination that addresses all of the content of the standards for the purpose of verifying that all candidates have mastered all of the adopted content. Other states, however, may choose to use an examination that focuses only on particular aspects of the standards felt to be the most important for candidates to demonstrate mastery of their knowledge and ability, and do not measure the full range of the adopted standards.

In turn, the range of content to be covered on the examination dictates, or influences to a great degree, the ***type of assessment items developed for and used within the examination***. This is the third key characteristic. The type of item chosen for an examination is usually determined based on the best, or most appropriate way, to measure the particular content to be assessed, unless there are significant cost limitations involved that would require the examination to be able to be entirely machine-scorable (the least expensive scoring alternative and typically consisting of selected-response item types only). ***Cost issues related to scoring the assessment*** is a fourth key characteristic.

Absent a cost limitation on the design of the assessment, and depending on the particular content required to be covered the assessment, assessment designers typically choose either:

- *Entirely selected-response items (e.g., multiple-choice);*
- *A combination of selected-response items and constructed-response items (potentially including performance-based or focused items typically presenting a proxy situation to candidates); or*
- *Entirely performance-based or performance-focused items (typically presenting a proxy situation to candidates)*

An example of an assessment that uses mostly selected-response items would be the ETS-developed School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA #1011). This is an “off-the-shelf”

assessment, based on national standards, that contains 100 multiple-choice questions and 7 short constructed-response items. An assessment consisting mostly or entirely of selected-response items is the least costly to score and to report because it is machine-scorable. Examinations of this type can typically measure a large range of candidate knowledge in an efficient manner, and typically focus on a single content objective rather than several content objectives within the same question.

It is important to note, however, that selected-response items are not necessarily simplistic in nature just because they use a multiple-choice or other format of selected-response. Higher-order thinking such as application, analysis, and evaluation can be assessed by selected-response item types. However, within a selected-response item the candidate is typically not asked to generate a response that applies his/her knowledge in multiple ways within an extended contextual situation (such as a scenario-based prompt that asks a candidate to make judgments). Some content, particularly factual content such as knowledge of laws and regulations, is most effectively and efficiently measured through a selected-response item type. These types of questions are an effective means of assessing a broad range and number of content objectives. They also make it easier to identify candidates who have the requisite knowledge, skill, or ability from those who don't, due to the focus on a single content objective within each question, and to analyze information about candidates and their preparation from wrong answer choices.

An example of an assessment that uses a combination of selected-response items and constructed-response items (including performance-based or focused items) would be the customized state-specific assessments developed by Pearson, including the California Preliminary Administrative Credential (CPACE) examination. This type of assessment is tailored to the individual state standards being measured rather than being based on national standards per se. An examination containing a combination of assessment item types is usually in the middle of the cost range for scoring and reporting because it uses both machine scoring and human scorers. Examinations of this type not only allow for a large range of candidate knowledge to be measured in an efficient manner, but also allow the candidate to demonstrate a level of extended contextualized performance within one or more focus areas selected by the state. Content that is more factual in nature, such as in the example above concerning candidate knowledge of laws and regulations, would typically be addressed through selected-response items, while candidate knowledge and ability that required more in-depth thought and judgment, such as reviewing a classroom video and providing analysis of the instruction and feedback to the teacher, would be measured through performance-based items.

An example of an assessment that uses entirely performance-based or performance-focused items, all of which present proxy situations and artifacts to the examinee for analysis and response, would be the Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT). This is typically the highest cost type of assessment for scoring and reporting because it relies entirely on people to do all of the scoring work. Examinations of this type usually focus on one or more key indicators of knowledge and ability determined by the state to be the most important for making a decision about a candidate. In the case of the Connecticut examination, the state chose to focus within the performance assessment on two key indicators felt to be broad enough to elicit the candidate's inclusion of information relating to the array of Connecticut administrator standards: the role of

an instructional supervisor and the school improvement process. More information on this assessment is presented later in this item.

Performance-based test items might include the example cited above of a classroom instruction video followed by the candidate's written analysis of the instruction and formative evaluation feedback to the teacher. Another item of this type would be providing contextual information about a school and its student outcomes and asking the candidate to formulate and present a written improvement plan based on that evidence. Candidate responses in the context of this examination require a more in-depth performance that requires the candidate to apply multiple knowledge and skills within the context specified by the test items.

Regardless of the assessment context, however, when making key decisions about which type of an assessment a state wants to have, it is important to consider (a) the intended purpose of the assessment, including the range of content to be measured; and (b) how the most amount of knowledge and skills determined important to be measured can be measured as effectively, efficiently and cost-effectively as possible.

An example of a new administrator performance assessment whose development is about to begin is the Massachusetts School Leadership Performance Assessment System. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts issued an RFP for an assessment that would measure its 2009 revised standards and performance indicators for school administrators. Responses to the RFP available publicly on the state website indicated that three responses had been received. A review of these responses shows that the applicants proposed to develop a series of performance items that, when taken as a whole, would represent the continuum of initial school leadership capacities as these are defined in state standards. It is anticipated that the assessment to be developed would be field tested during the 2013-14 school year. Based on the three responses available on the state's website it appears that the assessment design would reflect approaches similar to those used by other existing performance assessments in the field, as described above, in terms of providing proxy situations to candidates along with artifacts, documents, and other materials for the candidate's use in analyzing information and formulating a written response.

Other national entities are also looking at issues relating to the preparation and performance assessment of school leaders. For example, in October 2011 the Center for American Progress released a report entitled *Gateways to the Principalship: State Power to Improve the Quality of School Leaders* that identified eight states judged to be making improvements in principal preparation: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, New York, Rhode Island and Tennessee. The report further indicates that no states have instituted performance-based assessments at the point of initial licensure beyond requiring principal preparation programs to certify that their graduates have completed the approved program, although this report does not appear to take states like Connecticut, for example, into account. The report states that some states, Illinois, Louisiana, and New York, are moving toward requiring an assessment of the principal's performance for licensure renewal purposes (<http://www.americanprogress.org/wpcontent/uploads/issues/2011/10/pdf/principalship.pdf>).

Appendix A provides a national overview of the extent of states' use of an administrator performance assessment. It is interesting to note that of the states cited in the Center for American Progress report as making improvements in principal preparation, Delaware has no administrator performance assessment within the licensure process; Florida, Georgia, Illinois,

and New York use a customized Pearson-developed administrator assessment similar to the CPACE; and Rhode Island and Tennessee use the SLLA.

The Appendix also shows that of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia, 10 use a customized Pearson assessment for administrator certification purposes, 22 use the ETS-developed SLLA, 1 uses a customized assessment developed in collaboration with a testing company but not administered by the testing company, 1 has a new assessment under development, and 15 do not use an administrator licensure assessment. California is the only state that uses an assessment in lieu of, rather than in addition to, a preparation program.

A Brief Note: “Paper and Pencil Tests” vs. “Performance Tests”

Some recent criticism suggests that “paper and pencil” credentialing tests are inadequate and/or inappropriate measures of what a preliminary administrative services candidate knows and can do. However, all tests are, in essence, paper and pencil (despite many of them having migrated to computer-based administrations) in that candidates are responding on paper or computer to a question of some type in response to the test directions.

All licensure tests, regardless of the format of the test items, require a performance on the part of a candidate. For example, some tests require the candidate simply to recall knowledge of facts or theories. Some tests require candidates to interpret given facts or artifacts by selecting an appropriate response or creating an original short response. The candidate must still “perform” even in this more limited or lower-level context by choosing or creating responses that represent the candidate’s ability to select and apply information to do what is required in order to respond to each question.

The key concept is that there is a continuum of how extensive a candidate’s performance on the test needs to be to determine whether the candidate has mastered the required knowledge, skill, or ability. The most appropriate format for the assessment depends on the type of the content to be assessed and how that content can most efficiently be tested.

At the highest or most complex level of the range of test questions is what has come to be called “performance-based assessment.” The focus of questions in this context is typically on the analysis of the functions of a particular type of job, which in the education context means the job functions of a teacher, administrator, or other school personnel. All performance tests to date have actually been proxy examinations, including the Connecticut Administrator Test and the CPACE, except for the CPACE video (see below). In these assessments, the test questions concern a situation presented to the candidate rather than an analysis of the candidate’s own actions in the role of a school administrator. Absent a context where a candidate is actually acting in the role of an administrator him/herself, and absent footage of that candidate performing live in that role with students, teachers, parents, and or other members of the school community for analysis, the test questions can only approximate the context and conditions of actual performance on the job.

Even if it were possible to capture footage of a candidate acting on the job in the role of an administrator, the video *by itself and in and of itself* would not constitute a performance assessment. The essence of a performance assessment is the totality of the analysis, reflection, conclusions, and actions that would reflect the candidate’s ability to perform the complex,

integrated functions of the job role in the context of interactions with others in the school community and to review and critique his/her own performance in that role. This is exemplified within the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), since all TPA models require candidates to perform the job role of a teacher with actual K-12 students and then to reflect on that performance, including evidence of the effectiveness of the instruction and/or assessment of student work.

The CPACE-Video, however, may be unique in the world of preliminary administrative candidate assessment in that it does actually represent a true (i.e., non-proxy) performance assessment. For the CPACE-Video, candidates must conduct and video a communication activity with stakeholders, such as, for example, conferencing with a teacher about the teacher’s instruction, or conducting a parent meeting. The candidate must then respond to prompts that focus the candidate on reflecting on his/her own performance within that activity. Although it is the candidate’s own performance that is being assessed, due to the fact that administrative services candidates do not have a period of time analogous to student teaching, the context of the performance may, however, reflect a situation arranged by the candidate. To the best of staff knowledge, none of the other state assessments for beginning administrators uses this approach of requiring an actual performance on the part of the candidate him/herself as part of the assessment.

To summarize, all candidates “perform” by responding in writing to all questions, whether the questions include simple factual recall items or complex items that present a video and/or artifacts for the candidate’s written analysis. There is a difference, however, in the purpose, type and complexity of the questions to which the candidate responds in writing. This is a key concept to keep in mind when looking at the type, purpose, and context for California administrator examinations within the rest of this agenda item. The next section of this discussion focuses on these issues of purpose, type, and context of examination questions within administrator assessments.

Summary Overview of Three Administrator Examinations Used in the Nation

The table below provides a comparative look at three current administrator examinations used in the nation: the SLLA (School Leaders Licensure Assessment), the CAT (Connecticut Administrator Test), and the CPACE-Written (California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination) based on the examination characteristics discussed above.

	SLLA	CAT	CPACE-Written
Type of Test	Off-the-Shelf	State-specific	State-specific
Context of Use	Varies by state	All candidates in programs	Expedited (alternative) route to credential
Standards	SLLA Standards Based on ISLLC (2008)	Connecticut Standards for School Leaders (1994)	CPACE Content Specifications (2010)
Content Covered	All Standards	2 Focus Standards: Instructional Leadership, School Improvement (other standards subsumed in candidate responses)	All Standards

	SLLA	CAT	CPACE-Written
Item Types	100 Multiple-Choice, 7 Short Constructed-Response	4 Written Performance Modules: 2 Elementary-level, 2 Secondary-level	70 Multiple-Choice; 4 Performance Items (3 Focused Constructed-Response plus 1 Case Study) Plus 1 Video Submission
Testing Time	4 Hours	6.5 Hours	4 Hours (Written)
Score Scale	4 point scale 0-3	4 point scale 0-3	4 point scale 1-4
Examinee Fees	\$425	\$540 (\$125 x 4 modules plus \$40 registration fee)	\$427 (\$281 Written, \$146 Video)
Delivery Mode	Computer-based	Paper-based (Handwritten)	Computer-based (Written) Video Submission

Further Discussion of the Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT)

Because of the Commission’s interest in learning more about the Connecticut assessment, the following discussion provides additional details regarding this test.

The Connecticut Administrator Test, although administered at the end of a preparation program, is intended by the state as a *minimum competency* test. The assessment was initially developed with the assistance of ETS, and current CAT test modules (see below) were validated with the assistance of Professional Examination Services (now part of Pearson). There is a total of 8 administrator preparation programs in the state. The state itself administers and scores the assessment, typically three times per year plus a possible additional smaller summer session, through a regional educational service center (Eastconn). The state trains and calibrates the assessors, of whom a total of twelve are used per scoring session. Assessors are recalibrated at the beginning of each scoring session. The modules are intended to guide candidates to include information relevant to all of the standards via the prompts provided even though the modules focus on two key areas of instructional leadership and school improvement. The state uses candidate outcomes on the CAT in the accreditation of preparation programs: a program must have a minimum initial candidate passing rate of 80% on the CAT. The initial overall candidate passing rate on the assessment is approximately 80-85%.

According to state education officials, the CAT is intended to be taken by candidates as they complete coursework relating to the several areas of the modules. For example, when candidates complete coursework addressing the role of administrators as instructional leaders and as evaluators of classroom teaching, candidates are encouraged to take the CAT module(s) addressing instructional leadership. Scores on each module of the CAT are “bankable,” that is, passing scores on each completed test module remain valid until the candidate has completed all of the modules.

The CAT is not a computer-based assessment. Candidates complete all of the written responses by hand. This is the main reason why the test is as long as it is (6.5 hours) if the candidate takes all modules at the same testing session. If taken separately, modules range from a testing time of

70 minutes to 90 minutes, depending on the nature of the module. There is a classroom video excerpt of about 12 minutes (selected by the state testing administration) for the modules that address the administrator’s role in evaluation of teaching and learning, as well as a written transcript provided in the candidate’s materials of what takes place in that video excerpt.

Scoring is holistic on a four point score basis of 0-4. A score of “1” is “conditional.” The minimum passing standard is a total score of 7 on the four modules as a whole (or a minimum of scores of 2, 2, 2, and 1 on the four modules).

According to Connecticut officials responsible for the CAT, the state has just revised and adopted new state-contextualized ISLLC-based administrator credentialing standards in June 2012, and has updated the CAT test modules to incorporate the new standards. The state has not yet updated its public website with the new standards and any new sample test modules. Information presented in Appendix B concerning sample questions from the CAT are taken from the currently-available CAT web page.

A Look At a Sample CPACE-Written and Sample Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT) Performance-Based Test Item

Appendix B provides a comparative sample of a performance-based test item from both the California and the Connecticut administrator examinations. The performance item focuses on the area of School Improvement.

The sample performance-based items are noticeably similar across the two examinations in that both items:

	CSPACE- Written	CAT
Present the candidate with a “proxy” situation in which the candidate is to assume the role of an administrator for purposes of the examination	✓	✓
Provide a context for the candidate’s reflection and response	✓	✓
Provide artifacts, documents, and other supporting evidence for the candidate to consider in formulating a response	✓	✓
Provide guiding prompts for the candidate’s reflection and response	✓	✓
Are scored on four-point holistic rubric	✓	✓
Provide the scoring rubric in advance for candidates	✓	✓
Use trained scorers who are initially calibrated and then recalibrated during the scoring process	✓	✓

A Comparative Look at the Strengths and Weaknesses of the CSPACE and the CAT

The CSPACE and the CAT provide an interesting parallel in assessment approaches to determining that candidates for a preliminary administrative services credential have the entry-level knowledge, skills, and abilities (or knowledge, skills, and dispositions as these are called in Connecticut) required by state standards. As documented in the chart above, both approaches chose to require candidates to demonstrate their ability within performance-based questions to analyze and respond to proxy situations typically faced by school administrators as presented in defined contexts and question prompts for candidates. Only California went beyond the use of

proxy situations to require the candidate to provide a performance of his/her own in a live context as part of the assessment process.

In looking only at the examinations themselves, and not the use to which the examinations are put by each state, a remarkable similarity is evident in the content and format addressed by the respective performance-based questions. A major difference, however, occurs in the use and timing of the two assessments within the preliminary preparation sequence. For California, the examination replaces a preparation program. Candidates who take the assessment are expected to have demonstrated mastery of all of the content the Commission has deemed critical for a beginning administrator (as exemplified in the CPACE Content Specifications adopted by the Commission in 2009). For Connecticut, the examination is part of the preparation sequence, and candidates may, but do not have to, take portions of the assessment as the various topics come up within the preparation program's scope and sequence in order to demonstrate mastery of that content.

It is important to keep in mind that within the California approach to designing the assessment, the Commission directed that the CPACE should assure that candidates demonstrated their ability with respect not only to all standards in general, but within the standards to certain well-defined areas such as English learners, students with special needs, California laws and regulations, and the conditions of schooling in California. For this purpose, the Commission adopted the CPACE content specifications at its meeting of June 2010 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-5C.pdf>) and also adopted the weighting within the examination of the domains of the content specifications (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-5C-insert.pdf>). The assessment design for the CPACE included the use of multiple choice questions to best measure the content most effectively addressed by this question format, and performance-based questions to assess the candidate's ability to perform the job functions of a beginning administrator. The performance-based questions were of necessity more tightly focused than those on the Connecticut test in order for candidates to be able to respond to the performance-based questions within a reasonable testing time frame. This design also allowed the Commission's assessment to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities with respect to each of the Content Specifications across more than one test item. The Commission adopted a passing score standard based on this test design in August, 2011 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-08/2011-08-3B.pdf>).

In the Connecticut approach, the state chose to identify two overarching areas of instructional leadership and school improvement under which the state felt that most (but not all) of the other standards could be subsumed with the candidate's overall responses to the modules. This led to an assessment design in which there are only four modules for candidate response, but these modules, while similar in content and approach to the CPACE constructed-response items, provide more in-depth prompts for candidates and more extensive context information for use in candidate responses. The timing of the taking of these four modules individually or in multiples also is intended to coincide with the pace of coursework in the preparation program, although programs have the discretion to encourage candidates to coordinate the assessment with the timing of coursework or not. In staff conversations with Connecticut assessment personnel, this distinction between the two states' approaches was discussed, and the Connecticut personnel

expressed the point of view that the relative advantages and disadvantages of both approaches to covering all of the state standards were largely dependent on the decisions made by each state regarding the purpose and use of the assessment, and whether each state chose coverage of all or some of the adopted standards within the assessment.

The California assessment does not focus as specifically as the Connecticut assessment on the area of general instructional analysis and feedback, and does not include a classroom video for analysis within any of the performance-based questions, although the examination could potentially be modified to include a classroom video for review and analysis by the candidate. On the other hand, the Connecticut assessment does not focus specifically on issues relating to English learners, special education students, and state laws and regulations, and does not include an actual candidate performance as the CPACE does. Again, these are design issues reflecting the overall state's view on what the assessment should emphasize.

Part II: Policy Discussion

The following section of the item presents some policy issues relating to the purpose, timing, and design of examinations within the administrator preparation and credentialing process.

Due to a propitious confluence of several events and factors, this may be an opportune moment for the Commission to review its policies regarding how and where examinations best fit within the span of the administrator preparation and credentialing process. These factors are:

- The recommendations from the Commission's administrator preparation advisory panel
- The need to revise current preliminary administrator preparation standards
- The need to develop new second tier, administrator induction preparation standards
- The report and recommendations from the Educator Excellence Task Force
- The Commission's current review of administrator examinations
- The historical process of assuring that the Commission's adopted standards serve as the basis for both Commission-adopted program standards and Commission-adopted examinations
- The national interest in administrator assessments, particularly performance-based tests

The Commission has an interest and a responsibility to assure that administrative services candidates have sufficient knowledge, skills, and abilities to assume the role of a school administrator from the first day on the job. Examinations have historically had a role in helping the Commission meet its responsibility by verifying that candidates have the requisite qualifications based on adopted standards, at the minimum level of competence established by the Commission.

Two basic policy questions relating to examinations arise in this context:

1. Should a state-adopted examination have a role in the administrative services credentialing process? If so, what role, or roles, should the examination have and at what point(s) in the administrator preparation continuum? Where are the most appropriate leverage points within the administrator preparation continuum for using results of a candidate examination?

2. If a state-adopted examination should have a role in the administrative services credentialing process, what knowledge, skills, and abilities would most appropriately be measured, and how, at each identified assessment point in the administrator preparation continuum (i.e., should all of the Commission-adopted standards be measured, or should the assessment focus on selected standards identified by the Commission)?

Discussion of Assessments Within Preliminary Administrative Services Preparation

Many states use an examination as an end of program assessment, typically required as part of program completion requirements in order to qualify for a preliminary administrative services credential. For some states, these assessments serve a minimum competency purpose while other states set passing standards at a higher level consistent with a high-stakes exit requirement.

The Commission could consider adding an assessment requirement, whether as a minimum candidate competency test or as a capstone high-stakes test, for candidates in all preliminary administrator preparation programs. The end of the preliminary preparation program represents a significant leverage point within the administrator preparation continuum since upon completing preparation candidates can earn the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and begin service as a new administrator. The Commission's role as a regulatory agency makes this point in the preparation process a key target and leverage point for assessment use in order to assure employers, parents, and the community that the candidate is in fact ready to begin serving as a school administrator. Having all candidates throughout the state pass the same assessment at the end of the preliminary preparation program could provide evidence of the quality of preparation programs across the state as these results could be looked at within the accreditation process and across programs.

There is also a benefit to the state of having a California-developed assessment that includes a focus on California-specific content such as English Learners, California laws and regulations, and the conditions of California schooling, to name a few key examples.

Should the Commission wish to pursue the option for a candidate assessment at the end of preliminary preparation, there are several choices:

- Use the current Commission-developed examination
- Modify the current examination to be more or entirely performance-based
- Develop a new examination

Based on prior Commission discussion, it appears that the Commission might want such an assessment to be primarily or entirely performance-based whether the process involves the current examination or a new examination.

Discussion of Assessments Within Second Tier (Induction) Administrative Services Preparation

The Commission has adopted a revised structure for administrator preparation that includes an induction component within second tier preparation. Work is moving forward to develop standards for the induction component. Since the Commission has the opportunity now to relook at the array of both preliminary and second tier administrator preparation, the Commission might want to consider reframing the system for the clear credential to use a performance-based

assessment within the second tier (induction) sequence as a requirement for the clear administrative services credential for all candidates, whether or not the Commission also chooses to use an assessment within preliminary preparation.

Although the first, and perhaps more important, leverage point across the two levels of administrator preparation could be to use an assessment at the end of preliminary preparation, nonetheless the use of a candidate assessment during or at the end of the induction period could provide assurance to employers and to the public that the candidate has met the program requirements and has demonstrated mastery of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to be a fully effective California school administrator once the candidate had completed induction and was on his/her own. Having all candidates throughout the state pass the same assessment at the end of the induction program could also provide evidence of the quality of preparation programs across the state as these results could be looked at within the accreditation process and across programs.

It has been noted that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is developing an assessment for veteran administrators. It is important to note that this assessment is pitched at the level of experienced, accomplished administrators and not at the level of someone who has just completed induction. However, the National Board assessment could provide a helpful model during the potential development of the Commission's own assessment, were the Commission to choose the option of implementing an induction-level candidate performance assessment.

Summary and Further Considerations

If the Commission determines that there is a role for one or more examinations within the administrative services preparation continuum, the Commission's policy decisions could serve to identify:

- a) where the most effective leverage points of assessing candidates' level of knowledge, skills, and abilities would be along that continuum from preliminary to professional preparation (e.g., preliminary preparation, induction, or both);
- b) whether all required knowledge, skills, and abilities should be assessed at both levels of the continuum or only selected content should be assessed; and
- c) what the range of item types should be in the assessment (e.g., only performance-based test items or a combination of test item types).

Staff also notes that the choice of requiring a candidate assessment for program candidates at the preliminary preparation program level, and/or of requiring a candidate assessment for all candidates at the second tier (induction) preparation program level would likely require a change in the Education Code.

Next Steps and Future Agenda Items

Based on Commission discussion and direction, staff will develop and present future agenda items related to administrator assessments for Commission review and potential action.

Appendix A

State Survey of Administrator Examinations

State	Use of Test	Type of Test Items	Notes:
Alabama	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Alaska	None		
Arizona	Initial certification	100 multiple-choice items 4 performance items	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Arkansas	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
California ¹	Alternative to program completion for initial certification	100 multiple-choice items 4 performance items Video submission	CPACE
Colorado	Initial certification	multiple-choice items	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Connecticut	Initial certification	Performance based items	CAT-Administered by State of Connecticut
Delaware	None		
District of Columbia	Initial certification	Multiple-choice items	SLLA- ETS assessment
Florida	Initial certification	Multiple-choice items 1 essay	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Georgia	Initial certification	Multiple-choice items Constructed-response items	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Hawaii	None		
Idaho	None		
Illinois	Initial certification	125 multiple-choice items	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Indiana	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Iowa	None		
Kansas	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Kentucky	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Louisiana	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Maine	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Maryland	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Massachusetts	RFP issued to develop a performance assessment		
Michigan	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Minnesota	Initial certification		Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Mississippi	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Missouri	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Montana	None		
Nebraska	None		

State	Use of Test	Type of Test Items	Notes:
Nevada	None		
New Hampshire	None		
New Jersey	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
New Mexico	Initial certification	100 multiple-choice items	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
New York	Initial certification	60 multiple-choice items 2 written assignments (per part)	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
North Carolina	None		
North Dakota	None		
Ohio	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Oklahoma	Initial certification	50 multiple-choice items 2 constructed-response items	Pearson assessment, Similar to CPACE
Oregon ²	Continuing licensure	60 multiple-choice questions per subtest	
Pennsylvania	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Rhode Island	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
South Carolina	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
South Dakota	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Texas	Initial certification		
Tennessee	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Utah	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Vermont	None		
Virginia	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Washington	None		
West Virginia	Initial certification	Multiple-choice and constructed response	SLLA- ETS assessment
Wisconsin	None		
Wyoming	None		

¹Examination is instead of completing an approved program. In almost all other states, the examination is required in addition to completing an approved program.

²Examination is for renewal of the license

Appendix B

Sample Performance Item from the California and the Connecticut Administrator Examinations

School Improvement Focus

**CPACE Sample Item
School Improvement Focus**

Case Study Assignment and Candidate Questions

You are the new principal of Coyote Valley Elementary School. Read the five school documents provided. Citing specific evidence from the information given, write a response of about 300-600 words in which you:

- Identify one strength of the school
- Describe a strategy for building on this strength to improve the school's educational program and/or functioning;
- Identify two weaknesses or areas of concern for the school;
- For *each* weakness or areas of concern you have identified, describe one strategy to address that weakness or area of concern; and
- Explain why each of these strategies is likely to be effective in improving the school's educational program and/or functioning

Documents Provided to the Candidate:

Document 1: Excerpt from a letter written by the district personnel director to applicants for the position of Coyote Valley Elementary School Principal during the recent search process (last spring) describing the district's statistics

Document 2: State test results for Coyote Valley Elementary

**CAT Sample Item
School Improvement Focus**

Scenario

You are the newly named principal of Cedar High School, effective July 1. During the interview process you were informed by the superintendent that the Board of Education has recently agreed to begin to study the issue of class rank and the policy of assigning extra grade points for honors courses. The superintendent further indicated that she would set up a meeting with you to plan for this study.

Read the scenario and list of documents below, then read the questions on the following page. Once you have read all the materials, respond to each question. Support your responses with specific references to appropriate aspects of the documents.

Candidate Questions:

- Describe two significant issues/problems that impact teaching and learning presented in the scenario, the Strategic School Profile, and the other documents considered together. Describe each of the two issues/problems in detail, supporting your response with specific references to the Strategic School Profile and other documents, and explain specifically how each issue impacts teaching and learning.
- Based upon your vision of effective school leadership, what actions would you take, whom would you involve and what additional information would you seek in addressing these issues/problems in a way that would have a positive impact on student learning? What is your rationale for each action

**CPACE Sample Item
School Improvement Focus**

School (last year), including standardized testing results for all students over three years and results by student group over three years

Document 3: Excerpts from the minutes of a school site council meeting (last year) discussing parent volunteers, computer labs, and teacher turnover issues

Document 4: Memorandum from a previous principal concerning issues relating to the Parent Volunteer Program and budget issues

Document 5: Coyote Valley Elementary School Teacher Recruitment and Retention Summary (last year), indicating significant teacher turnover compared to the district

**CAT Sample Item
School Improvement Focus**

taken?

- How would you evaluate the effectiveness of the actions taken? What processes would you use, what people would you involve, and what specific criteria would you use to evaluate the effectiveness of these actions?

Documents Provided to the Candidate:

Document 1: Cedar High School Strategic School Profile

Document 2: Letter from the Superintendent regarding the Board decision to study the grading policy

Document 3: Letter from Director of Pupil Services regarding concerns about class rank and honors course credit

Document 4: Letter from Cedar High School Faculty Council concerning the grading policy

Document 5: Newspaper editorial concerning the recent action by the Board of Education concerning the grading policy