
4E

Action

Professional Services Committee

Update on Administrator Performance Assessments

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on administrator performance assessments and presents options for the Commission's consideration and potential action concerning the development and implementation of an administrator performance assessment for all Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates.

Policy Question: Which option(s) are most appropriate for the development and implementation of an administrator performance assessment for all preliminary administrative services candidates?

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt the recommendations presented in this agenda item concerning options for moving forward with the development and implementation of an administrator performance assessment for all Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates.

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal:

I. Educator Quality

- 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 2013

Update on Administrator Performance Assessments

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the administrator performance assessment in response to direction provided at the December 2012 Commission meeting and provides options for the Commission's consideration and potential adoption so that the work to implement the administrator performance assessment (APA) for all Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates can move forward in an appropriate and expeditious manner.

Background: Prior Commission Action and Direction Related to the Administrator Performance Assessment

At its December 2012 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-12/2012-12-4E.pdf>), the Commission took action to:

- 1) complete the current contract for use of the CPACE for the expedited route to the Preliminary Administrative Services credential;
- 2) develop an Administrator Performance Assessment for use with candidates for the expedited route to the credential, subject to the availability of identified funding; and
- 3) explore the viability of requiring the APA for all preliminary administrative services credential candidates in the future.

The Commission clarified its expectation that any and all forms of an APA adopted for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates, including expedited route candidates, would be centrally administered and scored and that administrative services credential programs would prepare enrolled candidates for the assessment. Expedited route candidates are not enrolled in programs and thus would be responsible for preparing for this assessment on their own. Stakeholders at the December 2012 meeting were very supportive of the plan to require an APA for all candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, and a similar recommendation was included in both the *Greatness by Design* report and the TAP panel recommendations.

In response to Commission direction at the December 2012 meeting, staff explored the feasibility of establishing the requirement of the APA for all Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates. Analysis of current law indicates that the Commission may establish an APA as a credential requirement without seeking additional statutory authority. The California Education Code (EC) grants the Commission broad authority to establish the standards and requirements for credentials (EC §44225) and specifies the *minimum requirements* for the administrative services credential.

The appropriate vehicle for moving this requirement forward would be Title 5 regulations and program standards. The proposed program standards for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential programs presented for adoption at the September 2013 meeting anticipates the future implementation of an administrator performance assessment by including language to this effect in draft Program Standard 14:

Proposed Program Standard 14: Assessment of Candidate Performance

Prior to recommending each candidate for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, the program determines on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the California Administrator Content Expectations and satisfactory performance on the full range of California Administrator Performance Expectations below. A representative of the program sponsor and at least one field/clinical supervisor provides the verification of candidate competence and performance. **When available, a Commission-approved Administrator Performance Assessment may be used to satisfy this requirement.** Satisfactory performance is defined as achieving competence as expected for entry-level administrators. During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance using formative assessment processes.

Considerations and Options for the Development and/or Adoption of an Administrator Performance Assessment

The state of the field: In looking at how best to move forward to implement the Commission's action concerning the APA for all preliminary administrative services credential candidates, staff considered the state of the field currently with respect to the development and validation of administrator performance assessments. Staff found that the area of administrator performance assessment has only begun to be addressed at the national and/or state levels. Nationally there is only one existing validated administrator performance assessment for beginning administrator candidates, in Connecticut. The Connecticut model is described in more detail below. An additional APA is currently under development in Massachusetts. The Connecticut model is based on candidate responses to complex scenarios, while the Massachusetts model, as we understand it, will be more situated in actual on-the-job performance. This distinction is clarified below.

Two approaches to performance assessment: There are two main approaches to measuring candidate performance: (1) using a scenario-based proxy for actual candidate on-the-job performance, such as presenting case studies and situational contexts (scenarios) that simulate the job role of the credential candidate, to which the candidate responds according to guiding prompts, and (2) requiring candidates to demonstrate actual on-the-job performance through a portfolio, for example, such as what occurs during the Teaching Performance Assessment process where candidates are performing the actual job role of a classroom teacher, typically during student teaching.

The context of administrator performance assessment is made more complex than that of teacher performance assessment by the fact that there is typically no extended on-the-job practicum within administrator preparation that is analogous to the student teaching experience for teacher candidates, where teaching performance assessment typically is placed. Teacher candidates typically are in charge of the classroom for an extended sequence of time, but while administrator candidates who are in preparation programs may have significant field experiences, they are not typically in charge of a school for an extended sequence of time. Further, administrative services candidates are not allowed by law and/or by local contractual agreements to perform some of the most important school administrator functions such as discipline of

students and of teachers, and teacher evaluation, without holding the actual administrative services credential.

California Context: In California, there are two types of administrative services candidates who would be assessed by an APA: those choosing the expedited (i.e., examination) route which waives program coursework and fieldwork for candidates successful on the designated examination(s) adopted by the Commission, and those choosing to complete an administrative services preparation program. In addition, California has recently adopted an updated set of both Content Expectations, which define the knowledge a preliminary administrative services candidate should have, and Performance Expectations, which define the expected application of this knowledge to performance in the job role of a school administrator.

When considering which type(s) of performance assessment are most appropriate to each group of candidates, it may be helpful to look at each group separately.

Expedited (Examination) Route Candidates: The CPACE examination contract ends in October 2014, with the last administration in June 2014. The Commission has directed staff to develop a plan to replace the CPACE with an administrator performance assessment for expedited route candidates. To implement this direction, the Commission has the opportunity to develop, adopt, or adapt a performance assessment for these candidates.

The Commission could determine that the assessment required of expedited route candidates should assess both their *content knowledge* (analogous to the knowledge included within preparation program coursework which the candidate is seeking to waive) and their ability to demonstrate *performance in the job role of a school administrator* (analogous to fieldwork in the preparation program, which the candidate is also seeking to waive). Such an approach, along with the other applicable credential requirements that were recently strengthened by the Commission, could increase confidence that these candidates were sufficiently prepared and qualified to earn the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

Examination route preliminary administrative services candidates would typically not be currently employed in an administrative position, and, since they would not be participating in fieldwork offered by a preparation program, would likely have difficulty taking a performance assessment which required actual on the job school administrative tasks to be performed and evaluated by an assessor. For all of these reasons, the Commission may want to consider requiring the assessment for the expedited (examination) route candidates to be comprised of both of the following components:

- 1) A written assessment of the candidate's content knowledge in alignment with the Commission's adopted Content Expectations; and
- 2) A performance assessment of the application of that knowledge to the job role of a school administrator via a scenario-based assessment that presents simulated administrative tasks and assignments;

Program Route Candidates: Candidates who choose to complete an administrative services preparation program would be demonstrating their content knowledge through coursework and program-designed assessments. These candidates would not need to complete a separate content-related assessment in order to demonstrate they had mastered the Commission's Content Expectations.

With respect to performance assessment of these candidates, it might be possible for them to complete an APA that required actual on the job performance in the role of a school administrator, but the program would need to assure that the field work component provided appropriate field experiences to allow the candidates to complete such an assessment.

The Commission might want to consider the use of a scenario-based administrator assessment for program route candidates as well as for expedited route candidates for the following reasons:

- The difficulty of arranging sufficiently comprehensive and extended field experiences that would be analogous to the student teaching period for teacher candidates;
- Legal and/or contractual constraints on the candidate's being able to carry out some of the key administrator job-role responsibilities such as student and teacher discipline and teacher evaluation; and
- The lack of a validated on-the-job APA currently available for use.

If the Commission chose to use a scenario-based APA for program route candidates, the Commission would have the opportunity to revisit this approach as the field of administrator performance assessment develops and if such assessments become available. Or, the Commission may want to consider the option of developing its own APA through issuing a no-cost Request for Proposals and establishing a contractual relationship with the successful bidder. The Commission has used this approach for examination development in the past, wherein the costs for development of an assessment are borne by a testing contractor that recoups payment for those services through candidate registration fees over a course of several years' administration of the assessment. Typically, the volume of test takers is a consideration for contractors in this situation, and the projected annual volume of approximately 2,500 California-trained preliminary administrative services credential candidates might not be large enough to attract contractor response. If the Commission were interested in pursuing this approach, staff could research this option more fully. Development of a Commission-owned APA would take more time than adoption of an existing instrument, possibly as long as 2-3 years.

Discussion of the Connecticut Administrator Test

Staff has identified one extant validated administrator assessment for beginning administrator candidates, the Connecticut Administrator Test, which could potentially provide a model for use with California candidates (<http://www.eastconn.org/index.php/component/content/article/9-uncategorised/235-connecticut-administrator-test-cat-main>). The Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT) is based on a foundational set of knowledge, skills, dispositions, and performance expectations from the *Common Core of Learning-Connecticut School Leadership Standards*. The Connecticut performance expectations are consistent with most of California's preliminary administrative services performance expectations, and are provided in Appendix A for information.

The CAT has been validated for use with candidates seeking a variety of Connecticut administrator certifications, but requires candidates to respond to situations within the context of a principal or supervisor. The CAT is a scenario-based form of assessment, providing scenarios for the candidate's reflection and responses. The assessment consists of two Instructional Analysis and Teacher Support modules (total of three and a half hours in length), one focused on an elementary school setting and one on a middle or high school setting, plus two School

Improvement modules (also a total of three and a half hours in length), one of which applies to an elementary school context and the other to a middle or high school context. The total assessment takes six and a half hours of testing time, and is typically divided into two separate testing sessions of two modules each.

Each of the two Instructional Analysis and Support modules presents a simulation that places the candidate in the role of a teacher's supervisor who has been asked by the teacher for help in improving instruction. Each module includes relevant printed materials and a brief video clip of a lesson segment. Candidates are provided with prompts to guide their responses.

Each of the two School Improvement modules presents a series of problems or issues. In each module, the candidate acts in the role of a principal new to the school. Each set of problems or issues is presented through a brief synopsis (scenario) followed by a set of documents that elaborate on the problems or issues involved in the case. Candidates are provided with prompts to guide their responses.

The Connecticut Administrator Test is administered by EASTCONN, which is a regional educational service agency located in Hampton, CT. The test is offered several times per year. EASTCONN oversees the registration and scoring processes.

In discussions with the Connecticut Department of Education, staff reviewed how the CAT was developed and validated. Staff has been invited to attend the next assessor training and scoring session in November 2013 to view the training and scoring of this assessment. It is possible that the Commission could be interested in adapting and/or adopting the Connecticut assessment for use in California. The Commission would need to arrange for a scoring contractor in order to implement this assessment on a statewide basis in California. There may be other considerations which would emerge from further discussions with Connecticut officials.

Options for the Commission's Consideration

A. Administrator Performance Assessment for Program Route Candidates

The Commission took action to direct staff to look into the feasibility of requiring an APA for all preliminary administrative services credential candidates. Staff has found that this action is within the Commission's authority and would require the adoption of Title 5 regulations. In order to make an APA available for use with all candidates, the Commission needs to determine what type of assessment will best meet California's needs. The following options are provided for the Commission's consideration:

- 1) Look into the possibility of using the Connecticut Administrator Test as a scenario-based administrator test for this purpose.
- 2) Issue a Request for Proposals for a no-cost contract to develop, validate and administer the Commission's own APA, whether scenario-based or portfolio-based.
- 3) Continue to monitor the developing field of administrator performance assessment and seek to collaborate with any other entities working in this field to adopt/adapt or develop an APA as soon as feasible.

B. The Expedited (Examination) Route to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

The CPACE contract is expiring in October 2014 with the last administration in June 2014, and the Commission has taken action to complete the CPACE contract and replace the CPACE with a performance assessment. Given:

- The Commission's intention to continue the expedited (examination) route to the preliminary administrative services credential;
- candidate and employer interest in the expedited (examination) route to the preliminary administrative services credential;
- the situation that there is currently no portfolio-based on the job administrator performance assessment available for potential California use; and
- the length of time it would take to develop the Commission's own APA,

staff presents the following options for the Commission's consideration concerning the expedited (examination) route to the credential:

- 1) Evaluate and either adopt or adapt an existing performance assessment that could potentially be readily implemented in California with no significant break in availability of an expedited route.
- 2) Adopt a new examination structure for the expedited route that includes a content component and a performance component. Implementing a new assessment structure could involve revising and update the CPACE item bank owned by the Commission to reflect Commission priorities and adopted administrator Content Expectations for use as the content examination for preliminary administrative services candidates, and evaluating other extant performance assessments for their applicability to the Commission's Administrator Performance Expectations and potential use in California. This option would result in the continued availability of the expedited route.
- 3) Issue a Request for Proposals for a no-cost contract to develop, validate and administer the Commission's own APA. This option would result in a gap in the availability of an assessment for the expedited route of up to 2-3 years.
- 4) Extend the CPACE contract for an additional year, if necessary, to ensure no break in the availability of an expedited route.

Staff Recommendations

- 1) Staff recommends that the Commission establish passage of an administrator performance assessment (APA) approved by the Commission that is aligned with the Commission's adopted Administrator Content and Performance Expectations (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-04/2013-04-3A.pdf>) as a credential requirement for all candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, subject to the availability of such an assessment, and direct staff to move forward with the regulatory process.
- 2) Staff recommends that the Commission specify that the APA would be centrally administered and scored, with preparation programs responsible for preparing enrolled (not expedited route) candidates for this assessment through relevant coursework and/or fieldwork experiences.

- 3) Staff recommends that the Commission implement the expedited route to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential through adopting one of the options presented above concerning the expedited route.
- 4) Staff recommends that the Commission determine if the APA for program route candidates should take the same approach as that adopted through recommendation 3 above or if the Commission wishes to implement a different APA option as outlined in the options presented above concerning program route candidates (i.e., to potentially use the Connecticut Administrator Test in California, issue an RFP to develop the Commission's own administrator performance assessment, or wait to move forward pending additional developments in the field of administrator performance assessment, or a combination of these approaches).

Appendix A

Connecticut Performance Expectations and Elements Overview

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission, and high expectations for student performance.

Element A. High Expectations for All: Leaders ensure that the creation of the vision, mission and goals establish high expectations for all students and staff.

Element B. Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals:

Leaders ensure that the process of implementing and sustaining the vision, mission, and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and commitment among all stakeholders.

Element C. Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals: Leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by consistently monitoring and refining the implementation of the vision, mission and goals.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 2: Teaching and Learning

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.

Element A. Strong Professional Culture: Leaders develop a strong professional culture which leads to quality instruction focused on student learning and the strengthening of professional competencies.

Element B. Curriculum and Instruction: Leaders understand and expect faculty to plan, implement, and evaluate standards-based curriculum and challenging instruction aligned with Connecticut and national standards.

Element C. Assessment and Accountability:

Leaders use assessments, data systems, and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress, and close achievement gaps.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 3: Organizational Systems and Safety

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.

Element A. Welfare and Safety of Students, Faculty and Staff: Leaders ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students, faculty and staff.

Element B. Operational Systems: Leaders distribute responsibilities and supervise management structures and practices to improve teaching and learning.

Element C. Fiscal and Human Resources: Leaders establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching and learning.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 4: Families and Stakeholders

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by collaborating with families and other stakeholders to respond to diverse community interests and needs and to mobilize community resources.

Element A. Collaboration with Families and Community Members: Leaders ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and other stakeholders.

Element B. Community Interests and Needs: Leaders respond and contribute to community interests and needs to provide high quality education for students and their families.

Element C. Community Resources: Leaders access resources shared among schools, districts, and communities in conjunction with other organizations and agencies that provide critical resources for children and families.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 5: Ethics and Integrity

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and staff by modeling ethical behavior and integrity.

Element A. Ethical and Legal Standards of the Profession: Leaders demonstrate ethical and legal behavior.

Element B. Personal Values and Beliefs: Leaders demonstrate a commitment to values, beliefs, and practices aligned with the vision, mission and goals for student learning.

Element C. High Standards for Self and Others: Leaders model and expect exemplary practices for personal and organizational performance, ensuring accountability for high standards of student learning.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 6: The Education System

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and advocate for their students, faculty and staff needs by influencing social, cultural, economic, legal, and political contexts affecting education.

Element A. Professional Influence: Leaders improve the broader social, cultural economic, legal and political, contexts of education for all students and families.

Element B. The Educational Policy Environment: Leaders uphold and contribute to policies and political support for excellence and equity in education.

Element C. Policy Engagement: Leaders engage policymakers to inform and improve education policy.