
3A

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Proposed Adoption of the Passing Score Standard for the Revised and Updated California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides (a) foundational information about the standard setting process for Commission examinations and (b) recommendations for passing score standards for the CPACE examination, which has been revised and updated to include content revisions and new performance tasks in alignment with the Commission's updated Administrator Content and Performance Expectations.

Policy Question: Does the recommended passing score standard for the CPACE examination meet Commission expectations?

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt the recommended passing score standard for the revised and updated CPACE examination.

Presenter: Michael Taylor, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality

- b) 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.

Proposed Adoption of the Passing Score Standard for the Revised and Updated California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Introduction

This report describes the standard setting study for the revised and updated California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE), and provides recommended initial passing standards for each subtest based on the recommendations from the CPACE Standard Setting Panel.

Background

Currently, individuals have the option of earning a preliminary administrative services credential by either completing a Commission approved preparation program or by passing a Commission approved examination. Since 2011, the CPACE has been the examination used by the Commission for this purpose. The Commission recently completed the process of updating the CPACE examination to address several concerns raised by the Commission. At the February 2014 Commission meeting, the Commission took the following actions:

- Authorized moving forward with the significant upgrade of the content portion of the CPACE, based on the Commission's updated Administrator Content and Performance Expectations (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>).
- Authorized the development of a new content/scenario-based Performance Assessment component that would replace the existing video performance component of CPACE. The Commission specified that the new performance assessment component would address the job roles of the principal as the school's instructional leader, the school improvement leader, and a leader in the larger community.

The revised CPACE examination consists of a two-part assessment: a Content Assessment to assure that administrative services candidates have the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified by the Commission as essential to the job role of a school administrator, and a Performance Assessment to assure that administrative services candidates have the ability to apply their knowledge, skills, and abilities appropriately to the job roles of the principal as the instructional leader of the school and as the leader of school improvement efforts and a leader in the larger community. These are the two areas prioritized by the Commission as the focus for the CPACE performance assessment component.

The Commission's adopted Administrator Content and Performance Expectations (Appendices A and B) define the content measured by the revised CPACE examination. The CPACE examination is comprised of two subtests. The CPACE content examination contains both multiple choice and focused constructed response tasks. The CPACE performance assessment subtest consists of two in-depth performance modules addressing instructional leadership and school improvement

leadership. The two subtests together as a whole address all of the Commission’s adopted Preliminary Administrative Services Content and Performance Expectations. The structure of the revised CPACE examination is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: CPACE Test Structure

Domain	Number of Competencies	CPACE–Content (603)		CPACE–Performance (604)	
		Approximate # of MCQs	# and Type of Assessment	# and Type of Assessment	
I: Visionary Leadership	4	12	3 focused written assignments		Module 2: School Leadership
II: Instructional Leadership	4	14		Module 1: Instructional Leadership	
III: School Improvement Leadership	4	12			
IV: Professional Learning and Growth Leadership	3	11			
V: Organizational and Systems Leadership	3	11			
VI: Community Leadership	2	10			
TOTAL	20	70 MCQs	3 focused written assignments	2 performance modules	

Responses to multiple-choice questions are machine scored as correct or incorrect. There is no penalty for guessing. Responses to the constructed-response assignments are scored independently by at least two qualified and well-trained California educators using standardized procedures. Responses are scored using a four-point score scale for constructed-response items. The scoring criteria are provided in Appendix B.

The CPACE Updating and Revision Process

To revise and update the CPACE, the Commission’s testing contractor, the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, worked with an advisory panel of California practicing administrators and administrator preparation experts appointed by the Executive Director. The CPACE development effort was on an accelerated schedule in order to meet the Commission’s expectation for the availability of this assessment for use with candidates in summer 2015. Below is the calendar of the key test development activities and dates.

Key CPACE Test Development Activity	Date
Commission adopts CPACE Content and Performance Expectations	December 2013
Item validation meetings with Content Expert Advisory Panel	June 2014
Development of new test items and materials	Summer 2014
Test items and materials review with Content Expert Advisory Panel	October 2014
Field testing of test items	Fall 2014 – Spring 2015
Selection of marker papers for scoring purposes	May 2015
Website and test preparation materials posting	May 2015
First test administration	July 2015
Standard setting study	August 2015
Commission adopts passing score standard	August 2015

In August 2014, an initial meeting was held with the content expert panel to review the existing CPACE item bank and identify items which were still in alignment with the new Administrator Content Expectations and/or the Administrator Performance Expectations, items that were not in alignment but could be updated to be aligned, items which needed to be replaced, and items that needed to be added to address gaps and/or new content. The meetings were completed on schedule and resulted in item development work to incorporate the panel’s suggestions.

In October 2014, a week-long series of meetings was held to conduct a bias review and a content review of the revised and new CPACE items, including both Content Assessment-related test items and Performance Assessment-related test items. At both the two-day Bias Review and the three-day Content Expert panel meetings, participants commented in particular on the scope and rigor of the test items for both the content assessment and the performance assessment components. This feedback is consistent with Commission direction to address the scope and the rigor of the new CPACE.

Field testing of the revised and new test items to see how they performed under actual operational conditions was conducted between fall 2014 and winter 2015, after which the results were analyzed and decisions made about the final item bank of items for operational use with all ASC candidates who attempt the examination route. The revised two-part CPACE examination became fully operational for all examination route ASC candidates in July 2015. Following the initial administration of the revised CPACE examination, a standard setting study was conducted and a recommendation for a passing score standard will be presented in the in-folder item related to this agenda item. Because of the timing of the deadlines for Commission agenda items relative to the timing of the standard setting study conducted on August 5 and 6, 2015, it was not possible to present the standard setting results in this initial agenda item.

Background: The Standard Setting Process

“Standard setting” is the common term used in the large-scale assessment industry to describe the process of determining a minimum passing score, or cut score, for new or revised

examinations. The term “standard” as it is used in standard setting refers to a performance standard, or minimum level of acceptable performance on an examination.

For criterion-referenced examinations like the CPACE, standard setting is a content-focused, structured process in which a panel of content area experts reviews the content of an examination, carefully considers the knowledge and skills being measured and relevant data such as question difficulty levels and potential pass rates for various cut scores to make an informed judgment about the minimum level of content knowledge that examinees should demonstrate to “pass” the examination. The standard setting process results in a recommended cut score from the content expert panel to the Commission, which has the authority to establish a minimum passing standard for CPACE.

Standard setting is a common and established process for determining valid and defensible minimum passing scores for examinations. Standard setting allows an authoritative body, in this case the Commission, to make an informed decision when establishing cut scores instead of arbitrarily selecting a minimum passing standard.

There have been many different methods for standard setting published and researched in the field of large-scale assessment over the last 50 years. Standard setting methods are in use today for various types of assessments all over the world. All of the most common standard setting methods for educational assessments involve the informed judgments of “raters,” or content area experts. The specific standard setting process used for CPACE is described more fully below.

The CPACE Standard Setting Study

The purpose of 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 examination. The educators on the Standard Setting Panel represented school site administrators, district-level administrators, and administrative preparation program faculty responsible for the preparation of school site administrators via the program route. Because of the timing of the standard setting study relative to agenda item deadlines, demographic information about the specific educators who served on the standard setting panels will be provided in the In-folder item.

As with the standard setting study method used for all other Commission examinations, the process employed for the CPACE exam was consistent with recognized psychometric principles and procedures. The standard setting study for CPACE was conducted on August 5 and 6, 2015.

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 examination 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 content expectations, performance expectations and the concept of the minimally competent level of subject knowledge and administrative skills for a beginning administrator. Panel members were asked to conceptualize the specific content knowledge and

skills of a hypothetical administrator candidate who would be minimally competent in the subject area. 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 each subtest. Although a number of examinees may exceed the level of acceptable knowledge and skills, none receiving a passing score should fall below this minimally competent level. The panel also reviewed the performance characteristics and score scales used to evaluate the constructed-response items and performance modules in the CPACE examination (Appendix B). After this extensive training and the simulated test taking, panel members completed the following three rounds of standard setting activities, as described below. These activities focused on arriving at an informed judgment as to what the potential cut score should be that reflects the minimum level of subject matter knowledge and administrative skills necessary for a beginning practitioner just competent to begin professional practice.

- Round One: For each multiple-choice item, the panel members were asked to independently rate the percent of minimally competent beginning administrators whom they think would likely answer the item correctly. For each constructed-response item, members were asked to independently indicate the level of response that would likely 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. The second 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 likely 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.

Separate ratings for each of the subtests were made during each of the three rounds. The Panel's recommendation represents the computed median of the third round results.

Results of the Standard Setting Study

As indicated above, the results of the standard setting study, along with a staff recommendation, will be provided in an in-folder item.

Standard Error of Measurement (SEM)

Once the final panel score recommendation is determined, an additional modification may be made to that score before it is recommended to the Commission. This modification is the determination and application of an adjustment that takes into consideration the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM). The SEM is a key measurement concept that addresses how accurately

the recommended passing score standard reflects the scores likely to be achieved by actual candidates in real-world testing situations. For example, an examinee takes the test one time and receives a score. If that same examinee were to take the same exam several times, with no change in his or her level of knowledge and preparation, it is possible that some of the resulting scores would be slightly higher or slightly lower than the score initially achieved by the examinee the first time he or she took the examination. Given this variation in possible scores on the same test by the same examinee, the examinee's initial score might not reflect the best score that examinee would hypothetically be able to achieve based on his or her actual knowledge and ability in the content area.

The range of scores an examinee would achieve across multiple administrations of the same test, were this activity to take place, includes what is known as the examinee's "true" score (the hypothetical score that would best reflect the examinee's actual ability) and the "observed score" (the actual score received on the first test administration).

A simple way to look at the concept of the standard error of measurement is to consider the case of the examinee who takes the CPACE examination one time. Many factors affect how the examinee does on his/her first attempt on the test, including knowledge of the content tested, affective factors such as the examinee's emotional, physical, and/or mental state on that particular day and time, and external factors such as the testing environment. Thus, it is not possible to say with certainty that the score obtained on the initial test taken by the examinee most accurately reflects his/her true level of knowledge, skills, and abilities. The likelihood that the examinee's true score is reflected on his/her first attempt is unknown. Thus, a computed Standard Error of Measurement is typically applied to adjust the minimum passing score for an examination in order to account for the difference in the examinee's true score and the examinee's observed score on the assessment.

How Does Applying the SEM Work?

As noted above, individual examinee scores on the first attempt could potentially not represent the examinee's true level of knowledge, skills, and abilities. The score could also potentially represent a "false negative" (i.e., the examinee did have sufficient knowledge, skills, and abilities but the actual score did not closely enough represent the examinee's true abilities) or a "false positive" (i.e., the examinee did not actually have sufficient knowledge, skills, and abilities but was able to earn a higher score than otherwise warranted). In the case of false positives, there is no psychometric approach to mitigating this outcome; in other words, the examinee is fortunate in achieving the passing score. However, there is a standard psychometric technique that does address the case of false negatives. This technique is the application of the SEM to the passing score standard established for a particular examination.

For example, on the CPACE examination, an examinee earns a raw score that is then translated into a scaled score. The SEM would be applied to the raw score that equates to the Commission's adopted passing score standard of a scaled score of 220. Thus, if the recommended cut score for an exam were to be a raw score of 30, which would equate to the adopted scale score of 220, the SEM would be applied to the raw score of 30. If the calculated SEM was minus 2 raw score

points, and was applied to the raw cut score of 30, the raw cut score would now be 28. Examinees would need to achieve at least 28 raw score points to pass the examination. If an examinee whose actual knowledge and ability should have allowed him or her to pass was only able to earn 29 raw score points due to factors other than his/her knowledge of the content such as, for example, emotional upset, application of the SEM to the minimum passing standard would allow him or her to receive a passing score, thereby avoiding a false negative.

The SEM can vary depending on the nature of the particular examination and the range of the candidate population for that examination. Typically multiple choice examinations that have clear right or wrong responses will have less variability in the range of candidate scores – either the candidate knows or does not know the content being assessed. In the case of constructed response and performance items, where candidates construct their own responses which are scored by trained readers, one might expect a larger range of variability in both responses and the background knowledge and abilities of candidates. It might also differ in the case where an examination is new, or the number of examinees is very low. Thus, a SEM could range from -1 to -5 or even higher. Each SEM is calculated individually for a particular examination and then consistently applied to the passing score for that examination.

The in-folder item to this agenda item will contain the recommended passing score standard for the CPACE examinations and a recommendation concerning the potential application of an SEM to the raw score which equates to the scaled score of 220.

Historical Information about the Previous Version of CPACE

The following information is provided for context in considering the recommended passing score standard for the revised/updated CPACE examination. Table 2 below shows the passing rates for each year of the previous version of the exam, beginning with the initial administration in 2011. The previous version of CPACE included a written examination and a video performance examination. Passing rates are shown for examinees’ first attempt at passing each subtest (first attempt) and separately for examinees’ most successful attempt at passing each subtest (best attempt) of the previous exam for each year the exam was administered (2011- 2015).

Table 2: CPACE Passing Rates 2011-2015

Program Year	CPACE: Written		CPACE: Video	
	First Attempt Pass Rate	Best Attempt Pass Rate	First Attempt Pass Rate	Best Attempt Pass Rate
All Years	23%	27%	76%	83%
2010-2011	30%	35%	66%	75%
2011-2012	37%	45%	72%	86%
2012-2013	27%	33%	79%	89%
2013-2014	20%	24%	76%	82%
2014-2015	15%	19%	76%	79%

Because examinees needed to pass both the written and video components to be eligible for the credential, the total passing rates for the combined subtests of the previous version of CPACE remained low throughout the life of the examination.

Next Steps

If the Commission adopts the recommended passing score standard for the CPACE examination, notification will be posted on the CPACE website and distributed to the field. In addition, recent examinees' scores will be calculated based on the adopted passing standard and scaled to a range of 100 to 300, with 220 representing the adopted passing standard for each exam. Individual examinee score reports will then be distributed within three to four weeks of the Commission's decision. The passing standard adopted by the Commission will be applied to all subsequent administrations of the CPACE.

Appendix A

Outline of the CPACE Content Specifications

The complete CPACE Content Specifications, including the extensive descriptive text for each of the competencies, are available on the Commission's Examinations website at the following link:

http://www.ctcexams.nesinc.com/PDF/CPACE_Content_Specifications.pdf.

Domain I: Visionary Leadership

- 0001 Developing and Articulating a Vision of Teaching and Learning for the School Consistent with the Overall Vision and Goals of the Local Education Agency (LEA)
- 0002 Developing a Shared Commitment to the Vision Among All Members of the School Community
- 0003 Leading by Example to Promote Implementation of the Vision
- 0004 Sharing Leadership with Others in the School Community

Domain II: Instructional Leadership

- 0005 Promoting Implementation of K–12 Standards, Pedagogical Skills, Effective Instructional Practices, and Student Assessments for Content Instruction^{2.2} Polynomial Equations and Inequalities
- 0006 Evaluating, Analyzing, and Providing Feedback on the Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction to Promote Student Learning and Teacher Professional Growth
- 0007 Demonstrating Understanding of the School and Community Context, Including the Instructional Implications of Cultural/Linguistic, Socioeconomic, and Political Factors
- 0008 Communicating with the School Community About Schoolwide Outcomes Data and Improvement Goals

Domain III: School Improvement Leadership

- 0009 Working with Others to Identify Student and School Needs and Developing a Data-Based School Growth Plan
- 0010 Implementing Change Strategies Based on Current, Relevant Theories and Best Practices in School Improvement
- 0011 Identifying and Using Available Human, Fiscal, and Material Resources to Implement the School Growth Plan^{3.4} Transformational Geometry
- 0012 Instituting a Collaborative, Ongoing Process of Monitoring and Revising the School Growth Plan Based on Student Outcomes

Domain IV: Professional Learning and Growth Leadership

- 0013 Modeling Lifelong Learning and Job-Related Professional Growth
- 0014 Helping Teachers Improve Their Individual Professional Practice Through Professional Growth Activities
- 0015 Identifying and Facilitating a Variety of Professional and Personal Growth Opportunities for Faculty, Staff, Parents, and Other Members of the School Community in Support of the Educational Program

Domain V: Organizational and Systems Leadership

- 0016 Understanding and Managing the Complex Interaction of All of the School's Systems to Promote Teaching and Learning
- 0017 Developing, Implementing, and Monitoring the School's Budget
- 0018 Implementing California School Laws, Guidelines, and Other Relevant Federal, State, and Local Requirements and Regulations

Domain VI: Community Leadership

- 0019 Representing and Promoting the School's Accomplishments and Needs to the LEA and the Public
- 0020 Involving the Community in Helping Achieve the School's Vision and Goals

Appendix B

Performance Characteristics and Scoring Scales for Constructed Response Items CPACE - CONTENT

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 Scale

SCORE POINT	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> <p>The response completely fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding fully to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates an accurate and effective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <p>The response provides strong supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p>
3	<p>The "3" response reflects an adequate understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <p>The response generally fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding adequately to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a generally accurate and reasonably effective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <p>The response provides adequate supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p>
2	<p>The "2" response reflects a limited understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <p>The response partially fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding in a limited way to the given task.</p> <p>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.</p>
1	<p>The "1" response reflects little or no understanding of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <p>The response fails to fulfill the purpose of the assignment by responding inadequately to the given task.</p> <p>The response demonstrates a largely inaccurate and/or ineffective application of the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p> <p>The response provides little or no supporting examples, evidence, and rationales based on the relevant content knowledge and skills from the applicable CPACE domains.</p>

CPACE – PERFORMANCE

SCORING CRITERIA FOR THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ASSIGNMENT

Performance Characteristics

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning: The extent to which the response reflects an accurate and appropriate assessment of the teacher’s effectiveness in engaging and supporting students in learning.

Assessing Student Learning: The extent to which the response reflects an accurate and appropriate evaluation of the teacher’s effectiveness in assessing student learning.

Developing as a Professional Educator: The extent to which the response reflects an accurate and appropriate understanding of the teacher’s development needs, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, and recommending strategies to foster and monitor growth as an effective educator.

Engagement and Support: The extent to which the response reflects engagement with the materials provided and is supported with examples, evidence, and rationales drawn from the materials.

Score Scale

SCORE POINT	SCORE POINT DESCRIPTION
4	<p>The "4" response reflects a thorough understanding of the materials provided and mastery of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across CPACE Performance Expectations in Domain II.</p> <p>The response reflects an accurate and appropriate assessment of the teacher’s effectiveness in engaging and supporting students in learning. There is a detailed explanation of all elements, including the lesson objectives’ clarity and reflectiveness of K-12 academic content standards and frameworks, the effectiveness of the instructional plan in promoting student engagement and learning, and the appropriateness of content specific pedagogy. There is an accurate and detailed description of how the teacher addressed variations in learning needs and developmental levels. The assessment is supported by specific, high-quality, and relevant examples from the observation and the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects an accurate and appropriate evaluation of the teacher’s effectiveness in assessing student learning. There is a detailed explanation of all elements, including how well the teacher monitored learning and provided feedback during the lesson, assessed student mastery of the learning objectives, and used the results of student monitoring and assessment. The evaluation is supported by specific, high-quality, and relevant examples from the observation and the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects an accurate and appropriate understanding of the teacher’s development needs, identifying strengths and areas of improvement, and recommending strategies to foster and monitor growth as an effective educator. The strategies to improve the teacher’s instruction are appropriate, effective, and thoroughly supported. The response includes specific, relevant explanations of how the strategies will benefit instruction and student learning.</p> <p>The response reflects a deep engagement with the materials provided, including analysis of the exhibits and synthesis of information across exhibits. Classroom observation, improvement strategies, and professional growth strategies are strongly supported with appropriate, relevant examples, evidence, and rationales drawn from the materials provided.</p>
3	<p>The "3" response reflects a general understanding of the materials provided and command of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across CPACE Performance Expectations in Domain II.</p> <p>The response reflects an adequate assessment of the teacher’s effectiveness in engaging and supporting students in learning. There is a competent explanation of the elements. There is a generally accurate</p>

	<p>description of how the teacher addressed variations in learning needs and developmental levels. The assessment is supported by adequate, generally relevant examples from the observation and the artifacts. The response reflects an adequate evaluation of the teacher’s effectiveness in assessing student learning. There is a competent explanation of the elements. The evaluation is supported by adequate, generally relevant examples from the observation and the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects an adequate understanding of the teacher’s development needs, identifying strengths and areas of improvement, and recommending strategies to foster and monitor growth as an effective educator. The strategies to improve the teacher’s instruction are appropriate, effective, and generally supported. The response includes adequate, generally relevant explanations of how the strategies will benefit instruction and student learning.</p> <p>The response reflects adequate engagement with the materials provided, including analysis of the exhibits. Classroom observation, improvement strategies, and professional growth strategies are adequately supported with generally appropriate and relevant examples, evidence, and rationales drawn from the materials provided.</p>
2	<p>The "2" response reflects a limited understanding of the materials provided and command of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across CPACE Performance Expectations in Domain II.</p> <p>The response reflects a limited assessment of the teacher’s effectiveness in engaging and supporting students in learning. There is a partial explanation of some of the elements. There is a partial description of how the teacher addressed variations in learning needs and developmental levels. The assessment is supported by few relevant examples from the observation and the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects a limited evaluation of the teacher’s effectiveness in assessing student learning. There is a partial explanation of some of the elements. The evaluation is supported by few relevant examples from the observation and the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects a limited understanding of the teacher’s development needs. The strategies to improve the teacher’s instruction are partially appropriate and/or effective; support is limited. The response includes partially relevant explanations of how the strategies will benefit instruction and student learning.</p> <p>The response reflects a shallow or limited engagement with the materials provided. There is limited support for classroom observation, improvement strategies, and professional growth strategies; examples, evidence, and rationales may not be appropriate, relevant, or drawn from the materials provided.</p>
1	<p>The "1" response reflects little or no understanding of the materials provided or command of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across CPACE Performance Expectations in Domain II.</p> <p>The response reflects little or no accurate and/or appropriate assessment of the teacher’s effectiveness in engaging and supporting students in learning. There is little or no explanation of the elements. There is little or no description of how the teacher addressed variations in learning needs and developmental levels. The assessment is supported by no or few examples from the observation and/or the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects a weak evaluation of the teacher’s effectiveness in assessing student learning. There is little or no explanation of the elements. The evaluation is supported by no or few examples from the observation and/or the artifacts.</p> <p>The response reflects little or no understanding of the teacher’s development needs. The strategies to improve the teacher’s instruction are inappropriate and/or ineffective; support is weak. The response includes little or no explanation of how the strategies will benefit instruction and student learning.</p> <p>The response reflects little or no engagement with the materials provided. There is little or no support for classroom observation, improvement strategies, and professional growth strategies. Examples, evidence, and rationales that are included are inappropriate, irrelevant, and/or not drawn from the materials provided.</p>

SCORING CRITERIA FOR THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT LEADERSHIP ASSIGNMENT

Performance Characteristics

Identifying School Accomplishments and Needs: The extent to which the response reflects an accurate and appropriate analysis of school strengths and issues that negatively affect student learning.

School Improvement, Instructional, and Organizational Leadership: The appropriateness and effectiveness of strategies offered to address the issues identified.

Monitoring the Improvement Plan: The appropriateness and effectiveness of strategies for evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement.

Engagement and Support: The extent to which the response reflects engagement with the materials provided and is supported with examples, evidence, and rationales drawn from the materials.

Score Scale

SCORE POINT	SCORE POINT DESCRIPTION
4	<p>The "4" response reflects a thorough understanding of the materials provided and mastery of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across all CPACE Performance Expectations.</p> <p>The response reflects a <i>thoroughly</i> accurate and appropriate analysis of the school; there are <i>detailed, high-quality, relevant</i> examples of strengths <i>and</i> issues that negatively affect student learning. The analysis includes <i>detailed</i> descriptions of the identified issues, <i>fully</i> supported by <i>relevant</i> and <i>specific</i> information from the exhibits.</p> <p>The strategies to address the issues identified are appropriate, effective, and <i>thoroughly</i> supported. Explanations of the strategies incorporate <i>specific, relevant</i> information regarding school goals, available resources, and stakeholder involvement. The response <i>fully</i> explains how the strategies will improve student learning.</p> <p>The strategies for evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement are appropriate, effective, and <i>thoroughly</i> described and supported. The response makes <i>specific, detailed</i> reference to stakeholder involvement in evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement.</p> <p>The response reflects a <i>deep</i> engagement with the materials provided, including analysis of the exhibits and synthesis of information across exhibits. School analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluation and progress monitoring strategies are <i>strongly</i> supported with appropriate, relevant examples, evidence, and rationales drawn from the materials provided.</p>
3	<p>The "3" response reflects an adequate understanding of the materials provided and command of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across all CPACE Performance Expectations.</p> <p>The response reflects a <i>generally</i> accurate and appropriate analysis of the school; there are <i>adequate relevant</i> examples of strengths <i>and</i> issues that negatively affect student learning. The analysis includes descriptions of the identified issues, <i>adequately</i> supported by <i>generally</i> relevant, specific information from the exhibits.</p> <p>The strategies to address the issues identified are appropriate, effective, and <i>generally</i> supported. Explanations of the strategies incorporate <i>generally</i> relevant information regarding school goals, available resources, and stakeholder involvement. The response <i>adequately</i> explains how the strategies will improve student learning.</p> <p>The strategies for evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement are <i>generally</i> appropriate, effective, and <i>adequately</i> described and supported. The response makes <i>adequate</i> reference to stakeholder involvement in evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement.</p>

	<p>The response reflects <i>adequate</i> engagement with the materials provided, including analysis of the exhibits. School analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluation and progress monitoring strategies are <i>adequately</i> supported with <i>generally</i> appropriate and relevant examples, evidence, and rationales drawn from the materials provided.</p>
2	<p>The "2" response reflects a limited understanding of the materials provided and command of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across all CPACE Performance Expectations.</p> <p>The response reflects a <i>partially</i> accurate and appropriate analysis of the school; there are <i>few relevant</i> examples of strengths <i>and/or</i> issues that negatively affect student learning. The analysis <i>partially</i> describes the identified issues; support is limited, and the information cited may not be consistently relevant. The strategies to address the issues identified are <i>partially</i> appropriate and/or effective; support is <i>limited</i>. Explanations of the strategies incorporate <i>partially</i> relevant information regarding school goals, available resources, and stakeholder involvement. The response <i>only partially</i> explains how the strategies will improve student learning.</p> <p>The strategies for evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement are partially appropriate and/or effective; support is <i>limited</i>. The response makes <i>limited</i> reference to stakeholder involvement in evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement.</p> <p>The response reflects a <i>shallow or limited</i> engagement with the materials provided. There is <i>limited</i> support for school analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluation and progress monitoring strategies; examples, evidence, and rationales may not be appropriate, relevant, or drawn from the materials provided.</p>
1	<p>The "1" response reflects little or no understanding of the materials provided or command of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities across all CPACE Performance Expectations.</p> <p>The response includes <i>little or no</i> accurate and/or appropriate analysis of the school; there are <i>no or few</i> relevant examples of strengths <i>and/or</i> issues that negatively affect student learning. The analysis includes <i>little, if any</i> description of issues that are identified or information from the exhibits.</p> <p>The strategies to address the issues identified are <i>inappropriate and/or ineffective</i>; support is <i>weak</i>. Explanations of the strategies <i>fail to</i> incorporate relevant information regarding school goals, available resources, and stakeholder involvement. The response <i>fails to</i> explain how the strategies will improve student learning.</p> <p>The strategies for evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement are <i>inappropriate and/or ineffective</i>; support is <i>weak</i>. The response makes <i>little or no</i> reference to stakeholder involvement in evaluating and monitoring progress and improvement.</p> <p>The response reflects <i>little or no</i> engagement with the materials provided. There is <i>little or no</i> support for school analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluation and progress monitoring strategies. Examples, evidence, and rationales that are included are inappropriate, irrelevant, and/or not drawn from the materials provided.</p>