
2F

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Development of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA)

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents an update on the efforts to develop the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA).

Policy Question: Does the development of the CalAPA align with the Commission's expectations?

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenter: Amy Reising, Director of Performance Assessments

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.

October 2016

Update on the Development of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA)

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on efforts to develop an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) based on the Administrator Performance [Assessment Design Standards](#) adopted at the Commission's February 2016 meeting and the revised [California Administrator Performance Expectations](#) (CAPEs) adopted at the June 2016 meeting. Approval of the CAPEs at the June 2016 meeting allowed the Commission staff, an appointed Administrator Performance Assessment Design Team (Appendix A), and the Commission's technical contractor, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (Evaluation Systems), to initiate the design and development of the Commission's model APA, which is called the CalAPA.

Background

At its [April 2016 meeting](#) the Commission approved the award of a contract to Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (ES) and directed staff to develop a scope of work to design and develop a model CalAPA. ES was appointed as a technical contractor to support Commission staff and an appointed Design Team of California educators, to design and develop the CalAPA.

Appendix B provides a graphic showing how the CalAPA Design Team is interacting with other technical advisors necessary to inform the development of the CalAPA, the Commission, Commission staff, and the Commission's technical contractor, Evaluation Systems. Currently Commission staff and Evaluation Systems are recruiting programs to participate in a pilot study of the draft CalAPA assessment tasks. The pilot study will be conducted between January and May of 2017.

The first task under this contract with Evaluation Systems was to conduct a validity study of the revised California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs), which was completed during the spring of 2016. Based on the findings of the validity study, at the June 2016 meeting, the Commission [adopted revised CAPEs](#) and directed staff to commence with the design and development of the CalAPA.

The CAPEs play an integral role in guiding the design and delivery of administrator preparation program curriculum and fieldwork experiences for preliminary administrative services credential candidates. Commission-approved Administrator Performance Assessments (APAs) are expected to measure CAPEs and provide critical and detailed feedback that a newly prepared administrator needs to improve and enhance his/her leadership and administration practice. The revised CAPEs are organized around the six California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL).

When it adopted the Design Standards for APAs, the Commission determined that model sponsors could design and develop alternatives to the CalAPA and submit them for review and

approval. Prospective APA model sponsors will be required to (a) demonstrate that their model meets the APA Design Standards and assesses the revised and adopted CAPEs, (b) submit their model for review by an expert panel, (c) be approved by the Commission for the field test, (d) field test their approved model, (e) recommend a passing standard to the Commission for approval, (f) be approved by the Commission for implementation, and (g) begin full implementation of their assessment model once approved.

Design Team Meetings

The CalAPA Design Team has fifteen members representing the full range of administrator preparation programs, administrator induction programs, and the geographic regions of California. A list of CalAPA Design Team members is included in Appendix A. To date, the CalAPA Design Team (DT) has engaged in six, two-day meetings. The first meeting was held in May 2016, and the next meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2016. After the November meeting, the CalAPA DT will meet every other month through June 2018, the end of the performance assessment development period. Short summaries of each meeting are provided below.

Meeting 1: May 26, 2016

At the inaugural meeting, the CalAPA DT members were introduced to their responsibilities and Commission expectations for their participation. The first topic on the agenda covered the history of state policy leading to the APA requirement in California. Commission staff explained the Commission's recent efforts to (a) strengthen and streamline the accreditation system, (b) develop data dashboards and outcome measures, (c) revise preliminary preparation program standards, (d) update and revise CAPEs, and (e) develop a model administrator performance assessment. The team reviewed the APA Design Standards and discussed the CAPEs and CAPE/CPSEL alignment study. Evaluation Systems provided an overview of Administrator Performance Assessments used in Massachusetts, Florida, New York, and the work of the National Board.

Meeting 2: June 22-23, 2016

The second APA Design Team meeting focused on a review of the CAPE validity study conducted by Evaluation Systems. The team continued to discuss examples of administrator performance assessments. A member of the Design Team, Dr. Janice Cook, (Director, Educational Leadership Development Academy, University of San Diego) provided information about the Performance Assessment for Leaders (PAL) developed by Massachusetts and two assessment tasks that the University of San Diego piloted in 2015-16 and discussed early findings from the study. The Design Team discussed options for a model CalAPA based on their program experiences, existing assessments, and research. These potential APA structures became the foundation for discussion at subsequent meetings.

Meeting 3: July 20-21, 2016

The team began work to determine a theory of action for the CalAPA and discussed the article, *Thinking like an Evaluator: A Paradigm for Preparing Practice-Ready and Change-Focused School Leaders*, (Fultz & Davis, 2014). The Design Team reflected on the developing tasks to determine which CAPEs were being measured, how much guidance would be provided for a leadership task, how much time it might take to complete a task, and where choice for the candidate was

introduced. The meeting closed with a discussion about criteria for selecting assessors to score the model CalAPA.

Meeting 4: August 17-18, 2016

Dr. Terry Orr from Bank Street College, joined the project as a consultant and provided deeper background into the Performance Assessment for Leaders (PAL) which she helped develop for Massachusetts's Department of Education. She further elaborated on work undertaken by the University of San Diego, with grant funding from the California Department of Education, to adapt two of the Massachusetts tasks for use as a self-assessment/professional development tool for prospective administrators. Two draft leadership tasks were introduced to the Design Team for review and feedback. The Design Team continued development of tasks and discussed parameters for the pilot study of the CalAPA. In addition, they offered recommendations about what support materials would be useful for candidates and programs as they implement the CalAPA.

Meeting: 5 September 14-15, 2016

Design Team members continued work on CalAPA tasks. Evaluation Systems provided a demonstration of their online submission process and explained the steps involved with uploading evidence for the CalAPA. Technology was demonstrated that allows candidates to time-stamp and annotate video recordings. Additional information was provided that explained what options were available for audio files. Evaluation Systems staff demonstrated the scoring platform and explained how the scoring process will be introduced in the pilot study and field test.

Meeting 6: October 19-20, 2016

Design Team members will finalize assessment tasks and scoring rubrics in preparation for the Pilot. The team will make recommendations for materials to support candidates and programs and discuss how information about the performance assessment can be shared across California.

The next CalAPA Design Team meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2016, as part of a joint meeting with the CalTPA Design Team. The CalTPA Design Team and the CalAPA Design Team will share their performance assessment development work and discuss similarities and differences between the two performance assessments. The two Design Teams will review and ensure that alignment between the systems is appropriate, knowing that increasing numbers of new California administrators will complete and pass a TPA prior to moving into administrator preparation. The CalAPA Design Team will continue to meet until August of 2018, providing recommendations to Commission staff throughout the pilot study and field test to inform the design and development of the Commission's model CalAPA.

Commission Bias Review Committee Meeting

The CalAPA tasks, rubrics, and materials drafted for the pilot study will be reviewed by the Commission's Bias Review Committee, on October 18, 2016. The role of the Bias Review Committee is specifically to identify potential bias issues. Commission and Evaluation Systems staff will review all committee findings and recommendations, including bias-related and content-related comments. Evaluation Systems and Commission staff will address all noted issues of potential bias by revising the 3 Leadership Cycles and rubrics, and materials as appropriate.

Structure and Key Features of the CalAPA

The Design Team has come to consensus that the CalAPA will have a task-based structure and will be completed at three different times during a candidate's preliminary program when they are at a school site placement. Each Task, or "Leadership Cycle" requires the candidate to engage in the *investigate, plan, act, and reflect* cycle.

This structure is intended by the Design Team to support an educative quality of the CalAPA, allowing candidates to complete a cycle of leadership, submit it for scoring, and receive assessment results including a pass or no pass score with analytic feedback about specific CAPEs. Programs can support candidates in improving their leadership practice based on their assessment results for the first Leadership Cycle, and again after the second Leadership Cycle.

Key Features of the CalAPA:

- Three Leadership Cycles focused on school site level work following the steps of *Investigate, Plan, Act, Reflect*
- Each of the three Leadership Cycles must be passed independently of the other Cycles
- Emphasis on multiple modalities for evidence across the three Leadership Cycles allowing candidates to submit annotated video, plans for implementation of academic priorities, observation of teaching practice and feedback, written narrative responses and reflections about practice
- Required video is directed, specific, and annotated
- Choice is offered in each Cycle in how to present evidence or reflect on practice (written response, written annotations, video with annotation, audio files, graphics)
- Candidate reflection on practice is required in each of the 3 Leadership Cycles
- Analytic rubrics (CAPE specific) and reports to candidates and programs, report should be detailed enough to guide learning plan for induction
- APA score results will be used in accreditation processes as an outcome measure
- Aggregated APA results will be posted on Commission dashboard

The three Leadership Cycles are intended by the Design Team to be completed in order, but the Cycles are not dependent on each other. Leadership Cycle 1 could lead to the data analysis plan developed and administered in Cycle 2 if the candidate is in the same school placement with the same faculty. Cycle 3 focuses on coaching and observation feedback to support an individual teacher. The teacher could be a teacher that participated in the group work conducted in Cycle 1 or Cycle 2. The three Cycles will focus on the following critical aspects of leadership:

- ***Cycle 1: Developing a Culture of Professional Learning for Improved Student Learning***
The focus of Leadership Cycle 1 is facilitating collaborative learning among a small team of teachers for the purpose of improving student learning. Within the cycle of investigate, plan, act, and reflect, preliminary administrators work with a small group of teachers to engage as a team in structured learning activities. The goal of the team's activities is to improve student learning by improving practice in a priority area for their school and students.

- ***Cycle 2: Using Data Collaboratively to Inform School Improvement***

The focus of Leadership Cycle 2 is conducting data-based investigations, and planning and facilitating collaborative data inquiries that support school improvement. Within a cycle of investigate, plan, act, and reflect, preliminary administrators collect and analyze multiple sources of data; engage staff and other stakeholders in a collaborative data inquiry focusing on program and/or instructional strengths and needs related to student learning; and develop a plan for improving student learning in a priority area informed by a vision for student-centered teaching and learning.

- ***Cycle 3: Supporting Individual Teachers through Observation and Coaching***

The focus of Leadership Cycle 3 is on coaching an individual teacher through a collaborative examination of the teacher's practice to promote student learning. Within a cycle of investigate, plan, act, and reflect, preliminary administrators become familiar with observation processes at their school; identify a teacher they will coach; and conduct two coaching cycles that include focused observations, pre-observations, and post-observations conferences. Cycles of Leadership can build on one another or each Cycle area of focus can be unique due to change in field placement or needs of the school, faculty, or students.

CalAPA Pilot Study Parameters

The CalAPA pilot study is scheduled to begin in January of 2017 and run through May of 2017. CalAPA pilot evidence will be submitted online to Evaluation Systems for preliminary review to assist with the development of marker evidence, inform the scoring process and assessor training, and to assist with determining revisions to tasks and rubrics of each Cycle in preparation for the field test to be held in 2017-18. All evidence submitted will be kept confidential. Participating programs will gain valuable information about how to design courses and support candidates to prepare for the revised CAPEs and newly developed CalAPA. The target number of participants is 150 across all types of preliminary administrator preparation programs.

Next Steps

Commission staff are launching a comprehensive plan for technical assistance that will unfold over the course of 2016-17 for the pilot study and 2017-18 for the field test. Preparation programs are updating their preliminary administrator programs to map to the CAPEs. The Commission's CalAPA Design Team will continue work on the model CalAPA in preparation for a Pilot Study in the first half of 2017. Staff will bring future updates to the Commission as milestones in development are reached.

Appendix A

California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalAPA) Design Team

Susan Belenardo, La Habra City School District
Rebecca Cheung, University of California, Berkeley
Kathy Condren, Madera County Office of Education
Janice Cook, University of San Diego
Katrine Czajkowski, Sweetwater Union High School District
Ardella Dailey, California State University, East Bay
Alan Enomoto, Brandman University
Deborah Erickson, Point Loma Nazarene University
Ursula Estrada-Reveles, Azusa Pacific University
Douglas Fisher, San Diego State University
Lanelle Gordin, Riverside County Office of Education
Keith Myatt, California State University, Dominguez Hills
Kelli Seydewitz, Irvine Unified School District
James Webb, William S. Hart Union High School District
Charles Weis, California State University, Channel Islands
Jose Gonzalez, Commission on Teacher Credentialing Liaison

Appendix B Commission CalAPA Development Process

Roles of the Commission, Staff, Content Experts, Design Team and the Contractor

