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# Update on the Alignment of the CAPEs and CPSEL and Proposed Adoption of Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards

**Executive Summary:** This item presents an update on the alignment of California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) with the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL), and the development of standards to guide the design and implementation of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA). This item also recommends that the Commission adopt the Assessment Design Standards.

**Policy Question**: Does the proposed realignment of CAPEs with CPSEL improve the clarity and coherence of the Commission’s standards for administrator preparation? Are the proposed draft standards consistent with the Commission’s policies for California performance assessments?

**Recommended Action:**

1. That the Commission a) approve the reorganization of the CAPEs as proposed, b) direct staff to meet with stakeholders to review proposed edits to the current content and performance expectations for preliminary administrator preparation, and c) return with revised CAPEs for consideration and adoption at a future meeting.
2. That the Commission adopt the draft APA Assessment Design Standards.
3. That the Commission allow program sponsors to design and develop alternative APAs and submit them for review and Commission approval under the APA Design Standards.
4. That the Commission approve the APA Implementation Standards for use during the development, piloting, and field testing of the APA.

**Presenters:** Amy Reising, Director of Development for Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments and Gay Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division

## Update on the Alignment of the CAPEs and CPSEL and Proposed Adoption and Approval of Administrator Performance Assessment Design and Program Implementation Standards

### Introduction

This item presents an update on the alignment of the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) with the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL), and the development of standards to guide the design and implementation of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA). Staff recommends that the Commission approve the reorganization of the CAPEs with the CPSEL, adopt the Assessment Design Standards and approve the APA Program Implementation Standards for use in the development and field testing of the APA. In addition, this item asks the Commission to allow program sponsors to develop and implement local APAs that meet the APA Design Standards.

### Background

At its September 2013 meeting, the Commission approved requiring a performance assessment for all preliminary administrative services credential candidates completing a Commission-approved preparation program and directed staff to move forward with the development and implementation of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) when sufficient resources became available (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-4E.pdf>).

The 2015 Budget Act provided funding to the Commission to support development of an APA. In anticipation of the opportunity to move forward with an APA, the Commission’s Performance Assessment Work Group (one of the work groups working on the effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system) developed draft APA Design Standards and related APA Program Implementation Standards for Commission consideration. Over the course of 2015, APA standards have been presented to the Commission for feedback and further consideration. Discussion of these standards has provided an opportunity for the field to become more informed about the goals of performance assessment in preliminary administrator preparation and the anticipated role of performance assessments in the revised accreditation system.

Commission staff brought the [draft APA Standards](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-10/2015-10-2F.pdf) to the Commission for consideration at the April, October, and December 2015 meetings. Stakeholders provided feedback at each of these meetings about the need to update the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) in light of the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL). The CAPEs govern preliminary administrator preparation programs, and the CPSEL govern new administrator induction and are the standards of practice for school administrators. While these standards have been adopted by the Commission within the last three years, implementation has indicated a need to bring them into closer alignment. Stakeholders also requested that the Commission allow for multiple models of APA to be reviewed and approved for use if they met the proposed design standards. In December 2015, the Commission directed staff to engage in further discussion with stakeholders about these issues. In January 2016 staff hosted two meetings, the first focused on the alignment of CAPEs and CPSEL, and the second showcasing models of local assessment. This item summarizes issues and recommendations from the field on these topics, and is presented in three parts.

Part I: Presents a proposed reorganization of the CAPEs that brings them into close alignment with the CPSEL and includes minor edits recommended by the stakeholders who participated in the meetings.

Part II: Presents revised APA Design Standards for Commission consideration and recommended adoption. Revisions highlighted in the Design Standards are based on public feedback gathered at meetings held from October 2015 through January 2016, and would allow the Commission to recognize alternative APA models submitted by program sponsors for review under the APA Design Standards. The APA Design Standards must be adopted in order to begin work on an APA in 2016.

Part III: Presents revised APA Implementation Standards for Commission review and approval for use in the development, piloting and field testing of a new APA. Revisions highlighted in the Implementation Standards are based on public feedback gathered at meetings held from October 2015 through January 2016. APA implementation Standards would be brought back to the Commission in the spring of 2018, for adoption once the APA is ready for implementation.

#### Part I: Alignment of the CAPEs and CPSEL

At its December 2015 meeting, the Commission was urged by some members of the stakeholder community, particularly the California Association of Professors of Education Administration (CAPEA), to postpone adoption of the APA Design Standards until a review of the CAPEs could be conducted, and the CAPEs could be revised and brought into stronger alignment with the CPSEL. Since the APA would be designed to assess key aspects of the CAPEs, it seemed reasonable to take more time to adopt the technical design standards in order to ensure that the performance expectations that would be assessed were appropriately aligned with the standards for the profession. Commission staff held a meeting on January 7, 2016 at the Commission office; seven individuals were able to attend in person, and eleven participated via Zoom.

Discussion focused on how to align the CAPEs to the CPSEL, how to represent details of preliminary practice that focus on issues of equity and social justice practices, how to keep the same structure for standards from preliminary to Induction programs, and how the APA will measure the CAPEs and impact field work placement. Karen Kearney, Director of Leadership Initiatives and Senior Program Associate at the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, shared documents showing how the CAPEs map to the CPSEL. She also shared *Descriptions of Practice* (a continuum of scales that describe growing administrative practice) that were recently developed and published for Administrator Induction programs based on the CPSEL. The group that participated in the meeting welcomed these documents, and urged the staff to use them to revise and reorient the CAPEs using the same standard titles as the CPSEL to facilitate new administrators’ movement into and through induction.

It is important to note that the 20 CAPEs do not stand in isolation from the rest of the Administrator Preparation Standards, which also include California Administrator Content Expectations (CACEs) and a set of program standards that address other aspects of preparation program quality. CACEs were introduced to support programs in building syllabi for program coursework. In addition, they were used to direct the development of the **California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination** (**CPACE**). The CACEs and the CAPEs together represent the knowledge and skills expected of beginning administrators. The CPSEL reflect an advanced level of preparation, and should build from the knowledge and skill base of the CACEs and CAPEs.

Table 1 provides a summary of the CAPEs and CPSEL (using their titles only) with the CAPEs reorganized so that they align and fit under the CPSEL Standards. Appendix A includes an expanded version of this table, complete with all of the currently adopted language of the CACEs, the CAPEs and the CPSEL. (Appendix A is formatted to fit legal size paper). Appendix B includes all proposed edits received from stakeholders to date on the CAPEs.

**Table 1: Proposed Alignment of CAPEs and CPSEL**

##### STANDARD 1: DEVELOPMENT & IMPLEMENTATION OF A SHARED VISION

| **California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES)** | **California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)** |
| --- | --- |
| CAPE 1: Developing and Articulating a Vision of Teaching and Learning for the School Consistent with the Local Education Agency’s Overall Vision and Goals**CAPE 2:** Developing a Shared Commitment to the Vision Among All Members of the School Community**CAPE 3:** Leading by Example to Promote Implementation of the Vision**CAPE 4:** Sharing Leadership of the Vision with Others in the School Community | **Standard 1:** Education leaders facilitate the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning and growth of all students.**Element 1A:** Student–Centered Vision**Element 1B:** Developing Shared Vision**Element 1C:** Vision Planning and Implementation |

##### STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

| **California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES)** | **California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)** |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPE 5:** Promoting Implementation of TK-12 Standards, Pedagogical Skills, Effective Instructional Practices and Student Assessments for Equitable Content Instruction for all students**CAPE 6:** Evaluating, Analyzing, and Providing Feedback about the Effectiveness of Instruction to Promote Equitable Student Learning **CAPE 7:** (formerly CAPE 9): Working with Others to Identify Diverse Student and School Needs and Developing a Comprehensive Data-Based School Growth Plan**CAPE 8:** (formerly CAPE 10): Identifying Change Strategies Based on Current, Relevant Theories and Best Practices in School Improvement**CAPE 9:** (formerly CAPE 12): Developing a Collaborative, Ongoing Process of Monitoring and Revising the Growth Plan Based on Student Outcomes**CAPE 10:** (formerly CAPE 14): Coaching Teachers Improve Their Individual Professional Practice Through Professional Learning Activities**CAPE 11:** (formerly CAPE 15): Identifying Professional and Personal Growth Opportunities for All Members of the School Community | **Standard 2:** Education leaders shape a collaborative culture of teaching and learning informed by professional standards and focused on student and professional growth.**Element 2A:** Professional Learning Culture**Element 2B:** Curriculum and Instruction**Element 2C:** Assessment and AccountabilityNo Test In This Cell |

##### STANDARD 3: MANAGEMENT AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

| **California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES)** | **California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)** |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPE 12:** (formerly CAPE 11): Identifying Available Human, Fiscal, and Material Resources to Implement the School Growth Plan**CAPE 13:** (formerly CAPE 16): Understanding the Complex Interaction of the School’s Systems**CAPE 14:** (formerly CAPE 17): Developing, Implementing, and Monitoring the School’s Budget | **Standard 3:**  Education leaders manage the organization to cultivate a safe and productive learning and working environment.**Element 3A:** Operations and Facilities**Element 3B:** Plans and Procedures **Element 3C:** Climate**Element 3D:** Fiscal and Human Resources |

##### STANDARD 4: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

| **California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES)** | **California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)** |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPE 15:** (formerly CAPE 8): Communicating With the Diverse School Community about Schoolwide Outcomes Data and Improvement Goals**CAPE 16:** (formerly CAPE 20) Involving the Community in the School’s Vision and Goals | **Standard 4:** Education leaders collaborate with families and other stakeholders to address diverse student and community interests and mobilize community resources.**Element 4A:** Parent and Family Engagement**Element 4B:** Community Partnerships**Element 4C:** Community Resources and Services  |

##### STANDARD 5: ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

| **California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES)** | **California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)** |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPE 17:** (formerly CAPE 7): Understanding the School Context to Create an Inclusive School Environment**CAPE 18:** (formerly CAPE 13): Modeling Life-Long Learning and Job-Related Professional Growth | **Standard 5:** Education leaders make decisions, model, and behave in ways that demonstrate professionalism, ethics, integrity, justice, and equity and hold staff to the same standard.**Element 5A:** Reflective Practice**Element 5B:** Ethical Decision-Making**Element 5C:** Ethical Action |

##### STANDARD 6: EXTERNAL CONTEXT AND POLICY

| **California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES)** | **California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)** |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPE 19:**(formerly CAPE 18): Understanding Local, State, and Federal Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines**CAPE 20:** (formerly CAPE 19): Representing and Promoting the School’s Accomplishments and Needs to the LEA and the Public | **Standard 6:** Education leaders influence political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts affecting education to improve education policies and practices.**Element 6A:** Understanding and Communicating Policy**Element 6B:** Professional Influence**Element 6C:** Policy Engagement  |

Appendix B includes proposed edits to the CAPEs recommended by stakeholders during the last several months intended to increase the focus on equity, better describe preliminary expectations for candidate performance, and improve alignment with the CAPSEL.

### **Staff Recommendation**:

**(**That the Commission a(1) approve the reorganization of the CAPEs as proposed, b(2) direct staff to meet with stakeholders to review the full set of proposed edits to the CAPEs, and c(3) return with revised CAPEs for consideration and adoption at a future meeting.

#### Part II: APA Design Standards

The APA Assessment Design Standards address the psychometric and technical properties for a Commission-approved performance assessment, along with related design considerations appropriate to assessment of beginning administrative services credential candidates. These standards form the basis for future development of an APA for candidates completing preliminary preparation for an Administrative Services Credential. They parallel significantly and were adapted from the existing [Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-12/2014-12-3D.pdf.) adopted in December 2014.

Assessment Design Standards express the Commission’s expectations about the nature of performance assessments that will, when developed and adopted, be used as one criterion for issuing a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential to prospective administrators. These standards are necessary to guide development of an APA. When the Commission initially considered and took action to require an APA for the Administrative Services Credential, the intent was to develop and maintain a single assessment that would be used by all program sponsors. This approach would strengthen reliability in administration and scoring of assessments, but would not allow for local innovation. The California Education Code allows multiple models of Teaching Performance Assessment to be recognized by the Commission if they meet TPA Design Standards, and the stakeholder community asked the Commission to reconsider and allow program sponsors to develop and submit local models that can meet the Assessment Design Standards for review and approval by the Commission.

Commission staff convened a Best Practices Forum in San Diego on January 15, 2016 and invited program sponsors to share performance assessments they currently implement to determine candidate competence and direct program improvement. The meeting was attended by 24 people, with another 11 attending via Zoom technology. The following eleven programs presented models, including tasks, rubrics, scoring processes and calibration approaches. Programs with an asterisk are institutions that represented the California Professors of Education Administration (CAPEA).

* University of San Diego
* Principal Leadership Institute, at UC Berkeley
* Principal Leadership Institute, at UCLA
* California State University, East Bay\*
* California State University, San Marcos\*
* Brandman University
* National University\*
* Pepperdine University\*
* Sacramento County Office of Education
* Orange County Office of Education
* San Diego County Office of Education

Participants discussed potential issues of reliability and validity based on current implementation of performance assessments in their programs and shared their thoughts about time, cost, and use of data. While many shared cautionary tales, no participants suggested eliminating any of the APA Design and Implementation Standards. Presentations of assessments were followed by a discussion focusing on issues of reliability, validity and implementation. Appendix C provides summary meeting notes. All participants were invited to continue to email editorial suggestions for the APA Design and Implementation standards to staff. They were also encouraged to provide feedback on the alignment chart of the CAPEs and CPSEL.

Participants at both meetings expressed strong support for allowing approved Preliminary Administrative Services Credential preparation programs to have the opportunity to develop their own APA as long as it met the APA Design and Implementation Standards.

Based on Commissioner discussion at the October, 2015 Commission meeting which indicated general support for allowing multiple models to be in use if they meet the Design Standards, staff have revised the draft standards to accommodate this change. The most visible change in language that addresses this issue is the focus on “model sponsors” instead of “contractors” as the entities that might be submitting an APA for review.

The Draft Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards are presented below.

**Draft California Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards**

**Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness**

The developer\* of an Administrator Performance Assessment (model sponsor) designs an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) in which complex assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics are linked to and assess California’s Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) with particular emphasis on school leadership. The assessment model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated, anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment’s validation process. The assessment is designed and validated to serve as a determination of a candidate’s status with respect to the CAPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended to the Commission based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning administrators to meet prior to licensure.

\**Note: the “model sponsor” refers to the entity or entities that develop an administrator performance assessment, administer and score the assessment, and are responsible to programs using the assessment and to the Commission. The model sponsor may be a state agency, individual institution, a consortium of institutions and/or partners, a private entity, and/or combinations of these.* *The “model sponsor” could be a single entity that both develops and administers and scores the assessment, or these tasks may be divided across several entities within a partnership or collaborative arrangement.*

**Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness**

1(a) The Administrator Performance Assessment includes complex assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the CAPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or major domains of the CAPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each administrative task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the CAPE elements that the task measures.. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of the CAPEs with particular emphasis on school leadership. The developer of the performance assessment documents the relationships between CAPE elements, tasks, and rubrics.

1(b) The Administrator Performance Assessment includes a focus on two key school administrator job roles within the design of the APA tasks and scoring rubrics to assess the candidate’s ability to effectively perform the job role of (1) the administrator as the instructional leader of the school and (2) the administrator as the school improvement leader.

1(c) Consistent with the language of the CAPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the APA with the use of different administrative practices that support implementation of effective teaching and learning for all students, and improvements of student and other educational outcomes. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of administrative practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.

1(d) APA candidate tasks focus on an administrator’s role in promoting and supporting effective teaching and specific learning outcomes for English learners, underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with special needs, to adequately assess the candidate’s ability to effectively perform the job role of the school’s instructional and improvement leader.

1(e) The APA may include a video or other media evidence of the administrative services candidate’s performance during fieldwork. If included in the APA, the video or other media must be accompanied by a commentary describing the activity and rationale for leadership decisions and actions shown and evidence of the effect of those decisions and actions in relation to selected aspects of the CAPE.

1(f) The APA model sponsor must develop materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the APA, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The APA model sponsor must also develop candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes, scoring processes, and appeal policies.

1(g) The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on administrator performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to administrative services competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as gender, height, speech patterns, volume and/or accents, or any other bias that could be related to appearance or behavior that are not likely to affect the candidate’s job effectiveness.

1(h) The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the administrator performance assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, preparation programs, the public schools, and TK-12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the competence of candidates for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential in California and as a source of useful information about preparation program quality and effectiveness.

1(i) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that administrator assessment tasks, rubrics, and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically free of bias, fair, and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.

1(j) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify administrator assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that show differential effects in relation to candidates’ race, ethnicity, language, gender, or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and documents steps taken to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.

1(k) In designing assessment administration procedures, the assessment model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or specific learning needs.

1(l) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of administrators, supervisors of administrative services candidates, and appropriate other preparers of administrators regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level school administrators. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.

1(m) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new administrator assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to CAPEs, and serve as a basis for determining entry-level administrator competence to lead California’s TK-12 public schools. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.

**Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness**

The APA model sponsor designs and develops an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the CAPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate’s performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate’s general administrative competence for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with the stated purpose of the assessment. The Administrator Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate, and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of administrator competence.

**Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness**

2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the CAPEs, the administrator assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate’s qualifications for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.

2(b) Administrator assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are pilot and field tested in practice before being used operationally in the APA. The model sponsor evaluates the pilot and field test results thoroughly and documents the pilot and field test designs, participation, methods, results and interpretation.

2(c) The Administrator Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses to the administrator assessment tasks. The assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the CAPEs, the tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training process includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The assessment model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the APA. The selection criteria must include but are not limited to appropriate administrative expertise in the content areas assessed within the APA. Only assessors who meet the sponsor’s established criteria are selected to score APAs, and only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required APA assessor training sequence are used. If new administrator tasks and scoring scales are incorporated into the APA, the assessment sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

2(d) The model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training process, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to improvements in the assessor training as needed.

2(e) The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using the assessment, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved APAs must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor’s assessor selection criteria. These local assessors are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and their scoring work is facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy at the local and state levels, and inter-rater reliability during pilot and field testing and during operational administration of the assessment.

2(f) The model sponsor must demonstrate that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate’s overall pass-fail status on the APA. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the assessment for candidates across the range of programs using centralized and local scoring, and inform the Commission where inconsistencies in scoring outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the CTC for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the APA.

2(g) The model sponsor’s APA system includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate’s response.

2(h) The model sponsor provides results on the APA for individual candidates based on performance relative to the specific scoring rubrics within three weeks following candidate submission of completed APA responses. The model sponsor must provide results to programs based on both individual and aggregate data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and the CAPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.

2(i) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the program and the Commission, in a manner, format, and timeframe specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. Programs have an opportunity to ensure accuracy in the data, and will report any inaccuracies to the model sponsor and the Commission. APA candidate and program results will be used within the Commission’s ongoing accreditation system.

**Assessment Design Standard 3: APA Assessment Sponsor Support Responsibilities**

The APA model sponsor provides technical support to administrator preparation programs using the assessment to support fidelity of implementation of the assessment as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a centralized scoring approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the programs and the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the assessment over time.

**Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 3: APA Assessment Sponsor Support Responsibilities**

3(a) The model sponsor provides ongoing technical assistance to programs implementing the APA concerning fidelity of implementation of the assessment as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the assessment.

3(b) A model sponsor conducting centralized scoring for programs is responsible for providing APA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor supervising/moderating local program scoring oversees data collection, data review with programs, and reporting.

3(c) The model sponsor is responsible for submitting at minimum an annual report to the Commission describing, among other data points, the programs served by the assessment, the number of candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when responses were received for scoring, the date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, the number of candidate appeals, first time passing rates, candidate completion passing rates, and other operational details as specified by the Commission.

3(d) The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the APA assessment, including making appropriate changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program and candidate materials, as directed by the Commission when necessitated by changes in TK-12 standards and/or in teacher or administrator preparation standards or expectations.

3(e) The model sponsor must define the retake policies for candidates who fail one or more parts of the APA which preserve the reliability and validity of the assessment results. The retake policies must include whether the task(s) on which the candidate was not successful must be retaken in whole or in part, with appropriate guidance for programs and candidates about which task and/or task components must be resubmitted for scoring by a second assessor and what the resubmitted response must include.

### Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission adopt the Assessment Design Standards and allow program sponsors who meet the APA Design Standards to voluntarily design and develop an APA and submit it to the Commission for review and approval.

#### Part III: APA Implementation Standards

Program Implementation Standards speak to the responsibility of program sponsors for embedding the performance assessment into their programs. At this time, the Commission is asked to approve the Implementation Standards for use during the development, piloting and field testing of the APA. Once field testing is completed in spring of 2018, final Implementation Standards will be brought to the Commission for review and adoption. A draft set of APA Program Implementation Standards based on and modeled after the adopted TPA Program Implementation Standards is included below.

**Draft Preliminary Administrator Preparation Program Implementation Standards**

**Standard 1: Implementation of the Administrator Performance Assessment (APA):**

**Program Administration Processes**

The program requires program faculty (including full time, adjunct, and other individuals providing instructional services to candidates within the program) to become knowledgeable about the APA and the APA process so that they can appropriately prepare candidates for the assessment and also use APA data for program improvement purposes.

**Required Elements for Standard 1: APA Program Administration Processes**

1(a) The program identifies one or more individuals responsible for supporting implementing the APA in accordance with implementation requirements.

1(b) If the APA requires a video or other media evidence, the program places candidates only in fieldwork placements where the candidate is able to record his/her administration activities. The program assures that each school or district where the candidate is placed has a video or media recording policy in place. The program requires candidates to affirm that the candidate has followed all applicable video or media policies for the APA task requiring a video or other media evidence, and maintains records of this affirmation for a full accreditation cycle.

1(c) lf the program participates in the local scoring option provided by the model sponsor, the program coordinates with the model sponsor to identify the local assessors who would be used to score APA responses from the program’s candidates.

1(d) The program maintains program level and candidate level APA data, including but not limited to individual and aggregated results of candidate performance over time. The program documents the use of these data for Commission reporting, accreditation, and program improvement purposes.

1(e) The program assures that candidates understand the appropriate use of materials submitted as part of their APA responses, the appropriate use of their individual performance data, privacy considerations relating to the use of candidate data, and the prohibition of posting any APA-related assessment materials, including candidate responses, video or other media on the internet and on social media sites.

1(f) A program using a local scoring process establishes and consistently uses appropriate measures to ensure the security of all APA training materials, including all print, online, video and other media, and assessor materials which may be in the program’s possession.

1(g) All programs have a clearly defined written appeal policy for candidates and inform candidates about the policy prior to the assessment. Candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or candidate response.

**Standard 2: Implementation of the Administrator Performance Assessment:**

**Candidate Preparation and Support**

The administrator preparation program assures that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the tasks within the Administrator Performance Assessment and the passing score standard for the assessment. The program provides multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the APA tasks/activities. The program assures that candidates understand that all responses to the APA submitted for scoring represent the candidate’s own work. For candidates who are not successful on the assessment, the program provides appropriate remediation support and guidance on resubmitting task components consistent with assessment guidelines.

2(a) The program implements as indicated below the following support activities for candidates:

These activities constitute **required** forms of support for candidates within the APA process:

* Providing candidates with access to handbooks and other explanatory materials about the APA and expectations for candidate performance on the assessment
* Explaining APA tasks and scoring rubrics
* Engaging candidates in formative experiences aligned with a APA (e.g., fieldwork assignments, observing, analyzing, and reviewing teacher classroom performance, and performing other administrative tasks during coursework and/or fieldwork)
* Providing candidates who are not successful on the assessment with additional support focusing on understanding the task(s) and rubric(s) on which the candidate was not successful as well as on understanding what needs to be resubmitted for scoring and the process for resubmitting responses for scoring

These activities constitute **acceptable, but not required** forms of support for candidates within the APA process:

* Guiding discussions about the APA tasks and scoring rubrics
* Providing support documents such as advice on making good choices about what to use within the assessment responses
* Using APA scoring rubrics on assignments other than the candidate responses submitted for scoring
* Asking probing questions about candidate draft APA responses, without providing direct edits or specific suggestions about the candidate’s work
* Assisting candidates in understanding how to use the electronic platforms for models/programs using electronic uploading of candidate responses
* Arranging technical assistance for the video or other media portion of the assessment, if the APA contains a video or other media requirement

These activities constitute **unacceptable** forms of support for candidates within the APA process:

* Editing a candidate’s official materials prior to submission and/ or prior to resubmission (for candidates who are unsuccessful on the assessment)
* Providing specific critique of candidate responses that suggests alternative responses, prior to submission for official scoring
* If a video or other types of media are part of the APA, telling candidates which recordings (evidence) to select for submission Uploading candidate APA responses (written responses, video, or other media entries) on public access social media websites

2(b) The program provides candidates with timely feedback on formative assessments and experiences preparatory to the APA. The feedback includes information relative to candidate demonstration of competency on the domains of the CAPEs.

2(c) The program provides opportunities for candidates who are not successful on the assessment to receive remedial assistance, and to retake the assessment. The program only recommends candidates who have met the passing score on the APA for a preliminary administrative services credential and have met all credential requirements.

**Standard 3: Implementation of the Administrator Performance Assessment:**

**Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability**

3(a) The model sponsor selects potential assessors for the centralized scoring option. The program selects potential assessors for the local scoring option that meets selection criteria established by the Commission. The selection criteria include but are not limited to administrative expertise in the content areas assessed within the APA. The model sponsor is responsible for training, calibration, and scoring reliability for all assessors in both local and centralized scoring options. All potential APA assessors must pass initial training and calibration prior to scoring and must remain calibrated throughout the scoring process.

### **Staff Recommendation**:

That the Commission approve the APA Implementation Standards for use during the development, piloting, and field testing of the APA.

### Next Steps

If the Commission approves the reorganization of the CAPEs to better align with the CPSEL and directs staff to work with stakeholders on proposed edits to the CAPEs, staff will continue to refine and circulate for review the draft CAPEs and return at a future meeting with revised language for the Commission’s consideration and adoption. If the Commission adopts the APA Design Standards and approves in concept the APA Implementation Standards, staff will determine an appropriate procurement process to select an entity or entities to develop the Commission sponsored APA. Staff will continue to provide updates to the Commission on the work to develop the Commission’s Administrator Performance Assessment.

## [Appendix A](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-02/2016-02-3f-appendix.pdf)