
4C

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Revising the Passing Score Standard for the California Administrator Performance Assessment

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides (a) foundational information about the standard setting process for Commission examinations and assessments and (b) recommendations for revising the passing score standard for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA).

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt a revised passing score standard effective January 1, 2022 for the CalAPA.

Presenters: Gay Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division, Amy Reising, Chief Deputy Director, and Heather Klesch, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

Revising the Passing Score Standard for the California Administrator Performance Assessment

Introduction

This agenda item provides (a) foundational information about the standard setting process for Commission-developed examinations and assessments and (b) recommendations for adopting a new passing score standard for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA).

Background

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) programs, in partnership with the Commission, an appointed Design Team, and Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (ES) have been engaged in the development and implementation of the CalAPA for the past six years, 2015-present. In June 2019, a standard setting panel comprised of California educators was convened to conduct a review of the 2018-19 CalAPA candidate score data and recommend a passing standard to the Commission for the 2019-20 operational administration. The membership of the CalAPA Design Team is provided in [Appendix A](#) and standard setting panel is provided in [Appendix B](#).

The Commission began discussing the development of a performance assessment for administrative services credential candidates in September 2012, approving the idea in September 2013. In 2015 the project was funded through the state budget act and development work began. To ensure scoring reliability, the CalAPA is centrally managed and scored by calibrated assessors to ensure that detailed, analytic, feedback based on the California Administrators' Performance Expectations (CAPE) is provided to candidates and programs in a timely manner to guide both candidate development and program improvement. As a result, CalAPA candidate data is consistent and reliable and aligns with the needs of the Commission's Accreditation Data System (ADS) providing an outcomes-based set of quality indicators to help guide review of administrator preparation programs.

After a two-year development by the CalAPA Design Team, PASC programs were provided a gradual implementation process for the CalAPA and their candidates. After a pilot year and a field-test year, candidates were offered a non-consequential scoring year, funded by the Commission, where all candidates were required to complete the CalAPA but with no passing score requirement. During the 2019-2020 academic year, the CalAPA became consequential and candidates were required to register, pay an assessment fee for each of the three cycles, and meet a Commission-adopted passing standard as a completion requirement for their PASC program. In anticipation of this, the Commission established an initial passing score in August 2019. Now, after two years' implementation of that passing score recommendation, it is appropriate for the Commission to revisit the panel's initial proposed passing standard and consider increasing the current passing score standard for the CalAPA beginning January 1,

2022. Commission staff will continue to monitor CalAPA score data in 2021-22 and will update the Commission at a future meeting, providing the opportunity for the Commission to consider adopting the initial recommendation made by the 2019 standard setting panel by January 1, 2023, if warranted.

Overview of the CalAPA

The CalAPA includes three leadership cycles that PASC candidates complete during their preliminary preparation program. The cycles require candidates to engage in a four-step process that includes investigating the context of a school and current practices, developing a plan, taking action based on the plan, and reflecting on the outcomes.

Leadership Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity

Leadership Cycle 1 focuses on analyzing multiple sources of school data for the purpose of identifying equity gaps to inform an initial draft plan for equitable improvement in line with the school's vision, mission, and goals. Within the cycle of investigate, plan, act, and reflect, candidates collect and analyze multiple sources of longitudinal quantitative and qualitative data. They then conduct an equity gap analysis to identify potential factors, institutional and/or structural, all culminating in a problem statement defining a specific area of educational need related to equity. Candidates seek input from a stakeholder(s) at the school site and alter their plan to address the equity issue. To close, the candidate reflects on equitable leadership. This cycle has 8 rubrics.

Leadership Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice

Leadership Cycle 2 focuses on facilitating collaborative professional learning within a community of practice for the purpose of improving teaching and student learning or well-being. Within the cycle of investigate, plan, act, and reflect, candidates begin by identifying and working with a small group of educators to identify a problem of practice. That group selects an evidence-based instructional strategy to address the problem of practice that will strengthen and increase equitable learning and/or well-being for all students. Then, during initial implementation of the selected strategy, they facilitate meetings with the group and collaboratively lead the professional learning of the community of practice. In addition, candidates reflect on how their facilitation supports the group to address the problem of practice, understands early implementation findings, and how they responded to the group's feedback on their facilitation. This cycle has 7 rubrics.

Leadership Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth

Leadership Cycle 3 focuses on coaching an individual teacher to strengthen teaching practices and improve student learning and/or well-being. Within the cycle of investigate, plan, act, and reflect, candidates familiarize themselves with coaching and observation practices at the school; identify a volunteer teacher with whom they work; and conduct a full coaching cycle, including a pre-observation meeting, a focused classroom observation to collect CSTP-related evidence of practice, and conduct a post-observation meeting. Throughout this leadership cycle, candidates reflect on their strengths and areas for professional growth as an instructional coach and an equity minded leader. This cycle has 7 rubrics.

Analytic Rubric Scoring Process

The CalAPA analytic rubrics consist of a five-point scale. With 8 rubrics, Cycle 1 has a possible score total of 40 points, while Cycles 2 and 3, with 7 rubrics each, have possible score totals of 35 points. Each rubric has an essential question, outlining the specific points that will be assessed in that rubric. Each of the five levels of the rubric provide qualitative descriptions of performance based on the CAPE. Should a candidate provide exactly the evidence required in the essential question, they receive a score of “3”; therefore, a candidate providing exactly what is required at the 3 level in each rubric would receive total scores of 24, 21, and 21 for the three cycles. Providing additional information, as outlined in levels 4 and 5, allows the candidate to improve their score while providing off-target or incomplete evidence results in a lower score of 1 or 2. Often, the level 1 score is applied when the candidate is missing key evidence outlined in the rubric level description and essential question.

CalAPA First Operational/Non-Consequential Year and Standard Setting Study 2018-2019

Following a pilot test in 2016-17 and the field test conducted in 2017-18, the CalAPA became operational for all PASC programs in fall 2018. During the first operational/non-consequential year, implementation of the CalAPA was required of all PASC programs, with candidates required to fully complete and submit all three cycles of the CalAPA. In order to be considered as a “non-consequential” candidate, the candidate needed to be enrolled in an Administrative Services Credential Program between June 1, 2018 through May 31, 2019. Non-consequential candidates were required to complete all three CalAPA cycles by December 31, 2020. During this first operational year, non-consequential candidates were not required to meet a passing standard in order to be recommended for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential or Certificate of Eligibility. For purposes of the June 2019 standard setting study, all complete and scored submissions through June 6, 2019 were included in the data analysis in preparation for the standard setting process.

Summary Overview of the Standard Setting Process

“Standard setting” is the common term used in the large-scale assessment industry to describe the process of establishing a minimum passing score, or cut score, for new or revised assessments. The term “standard” as it is used in “standard setting” refers to a performance standard, or minimum level of acceptable performance on an assessment.

Standard setting is a common and established process for determining valid and defensible minimum passing scores for standardized assessments. 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.

For criterion-referenced assessments¹ such as the CalAPA, standard setting is a content-focused, structured process in which a panel of education experts reviews the content of the assessment, carefully considers the performance expectations being measured as well as

¹ Criterion-referenced assessments are designed to measure a candidate’s knowledge, skills, and abilities in a specific domain of content. Candidates are assessed on the basis of their performance relative to a specific, predetermined criterion or standard.

relevant data and potential pass rates at various cut scores to make an informed judgment about the minimum performance level that candidates would need to demonstrate to “pass” the assessment. The standard setting process conducted by Evaluation Systems resulted in a recommended cut score from the expert panel to the Commission for each of the three leadership cycles of the CalAPA.

There have been many different methods for standard setting developed, researched and published in the field of large-scale assessment over the last 50 years. These standard setting methods are in use today for various types of assessments all over the world. However, all of the most common standard setting methods for educational assessments involve the informed judgments of qualified “raters,” or content-specific pedagogical experts.

As with the standard setting study method used for all other Commission examinations (e.g. CSET, CTEL, RICA, CPACE, CalTPA), the process employed for the CalAPA was consistent with recognized psychometric principles and procedures. The standard setting study for the CalAPA was conducted over a two-day period, June 25-26, 2019, with pre-conference preparatory activities taking place for the expert panel prior to the meeting. The specific standard setting process used during the meeting for the CalAPA is described in full detail in [Appendix C](#).

Passing Score Recommendation of the 2019 Expert Standard Setting Panel

All of the expert panel’s standard setting discussions for the initial and final cut score recommendations, made at the conclusion of the second day’s standard setting activities, were framed by the following context statement and guiding question:

- Think about an administrator candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new administrator in California public schools.
- What score (the sum of all the rubric scores in the Cycle) represents the level of performance that would be achieved by this individual?

The guiding questions addressed candidate performance across all rubrics in each cycle. Cycle 1 has eight rubrics while Cycles 2 and 3 each have seven rubrics. Each cycle must be independently passed. Discussion was also conducted to allow for panel recommendations concerning any “side conditions” such as, for example, placing a limitation on the number of rubric scores of “1” that would ultimately be allowed for a cycle under the final recommended passing score. A score of “1” is the lowest score on the 5-point rubric scale and represents a response that provides little to no accurate or appropriate evidence. Through a facilitated discussion, panelists were presented with CalAPA descriptive data, the activities described in [Appendix C](#) were conducted, and each panelist recommended an initial passing score during the early part of Day Two’s activities.

To arrive at the final standard setting and passing standard recommendations to be presented to the Commission, panelists were provided descriptive and summary data, to help guide their recommendations. Descriptive and summary data included the number of submissions scored in each CalAPA cycle, a summary of the aggregate rubric, step of the cycle, and total CalAPA performance (mean, standard deviation, median, minimum, maximum) for all scored

candidates. These performance descriptive statistics were provided both in aggregate and broken out by rubric for each CalAPA cycle. Demographics and total score descriptive performance statistics (number, percent, mean, standard deviation, median, minimum, maximum) were provided by gender, ethnicity, placement setting, and candidate primary language. Finally, a distribution of total scores was provided for the complete data set.

After reviewing the descriptive and summary data, and following discussion with the whole group, panelists were asked to make an initial recommendation for a cut score, including any recommendation regarding setting any side conditions for that cut score.

Panelists were then shown fellow panel recommendations (anonymously), including frequencies for individual initial recommendations of a cut score, as well as the mean, median, mode, minimum and maximum scoring for the initial cut score recommendations. Panelists were also shown a summary of condition recommendations – both the frequency and associated recommendation.

Final Passing Score Recommendation

Through a facilitated discussion, and after examining the initial recommendations, panelists were presented with CalAPA impact data reflecting the number and percent of candidates who would theoretically pass at each potential recommended level, including modeled pass rates provided by gender, ethnicity, placement setting, and candidate primary language. A final passing score was ultimately recommended by each panelist.

The standard setting panelists recommended the following passing scores for each of the three leadership cycles.

- Cycle 1 (8 rubrics): A final cut score of **19 points** was the panel-recommended median
- Cycle 2 (7 rubrics): A final cut score of **17 points** was the panel-recommended median
- Cycle 3 (7 rubrics): A final cut score of **17 points** was the panel-recommended median

The table below shows the rubric level scores, for all scored cycles during the first year of implementation. Rubric scores are shown for candidates’ first attempt at passing each cycle. The data table shows the panel recommendation for each cycle is below the mean candidate performance from 2018-2019.

Table 1: Summary of Rubric Scores in 2018-2019

Field	N	Mean	SD	Median
Cycle 1 (8 rubrics, total 40 pts)	1,385	23.1	5.50	23.0
Cycle 2 (7 rubrics, total 35 pts)	975	19.2	4.39	19.0
Cycle 3 (7 rubrics, total 35 pts)	906*	20.1	3.53	20.0

*Total N in Table 1 is different for each cycle because data was identified for use for the standard setting study as of June 6, 2019. N’s in Table 1 represent the total number of scored cycles available at the June date. In early June, fewer candidates had submitted Cycles 2 and 3 but would go on to submit in late June and July. Programs do not need to complete cycles in

any particular order, but these numbers do reflect that order of cycles started with completion of Cycle 1, and then 2 and 3.

Commission Adoption of a Passing Score

At the August, 2019 Commission meeting, staff recommended that the Commission adopt passing scores that reflected an SEM² of -1.5 for each of the three cycles (14 points for Cycle 1, 12 points for both Cycle 2 and Cycle 3), in response to subgroup performance analysis, as well as to be supportive of programs who were in the early stages of supporting faculty, instructors, field supervisors, and candidates with the new CalAPA.

The intention at that time was to revisit the scores one year later, however, due to complications of the COVID-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020, CalAPA passing score data were not brought forward to the Commission for consideration of a revision to the passing standard.

CalAPA Operational 2020-21 Data

Candidate data has been continually monitored by the Commission and ES. In examining the 2020-2021 year, candidate passing data for scored submissions is high for the three cycles, with Cycle 1 (14 points) at approximately 99% passing, Cycle 2 (12 points) at approximately 100% passing, and Cycle 3 (12 points) at 100% approximately passing as the median scores are 23, 19, and 21 respectively, which show a slight increase in candidate performance since 2019.

Table 2: Summary of Rubric Scores through May 2021 (Consequential candidates only)

Field	N	Mean	SD	Median
Cycle 1 (8 rubrics, total 40 pts)	2,544	23.3	4.10	23.0
Cycle 2 (7 rubrics, total 35 pts)	1,553	19.5	3.91	19.0
Cycle 3 (7 rubrics, total 35 pts)	1,452	20.5	3.18	21.0

Additional sub-group analysis by ethnicity is also positive with no sub-groups performing at significantly lower rates. The majority of candidates have been able to pass the three cycles of the CalAPA at the entry level passing standards adopted by the Commission in 2019.

² This modification is the determination and potential application of an adjustment known as the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM). The SEM represents the uncertainty of our reliability in the measure of candidate performance and quantifies some error in measurement by taking into consideration the fact that an assessment represents a single point in time when a candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities are measured. For these reasons, an adjustment for this "standard error of measurement," or SEM, may sometimes be made to address these factors.

Table 3: Summary of Percentage of Passage Rates at Current Passing Standard through May 2021 According to Ethnicity (Consequential candidates only)

Cut scores	All	N/A	Black	Asian	SE Asian	Pacific Isl.	Hispanic	Native Amer	White	Other
N	1,047	49	72	58	42	5	313	4	475	29
C1=14 C2=12 C3=12	99%	100%	97%	98%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%

These high passing rates for each cycle provides the opportunity for the Commission to reconsider the panel’s original passing standard recommendation of Cycle 1 at 19 points, and Cycles 2 and 3 each at 17 points. The table below shows modeled pass rates when applying a 2-year planned increase to the current passing score in order to arrive at the standard setting team’s passing scores recommendations (19, 17,17). A phased approach, as proposed, would allow for an intermediate step half-way between the current cut scores (14, 12, 12) and the standard setting panel’s recommended cut scores (19, 17, 17).

Table 4: Summary of Modeled Percentage of Passing Candidates through May 2021 According to Ethnicity (Consequential candidates only)

Cut scores	All	N/A	Black	Asian	SE Asian	Pacific Isl.	Hispanic	Native Amer	White	Other
N	1,047	49	72	58	42	5	313	4	475	29
proposed 1/1/22 C1=16 C2=14 C3=14	97%	98%	97%	95%	98%	100%	96%	100%	96%	100%

2020-21 passing score data, including a review of sub-group analysis by ethnicity, does not support adjusting the passing standard to the full recommendation made by the 2019 panel, but does support taking a half step toward the final recommendation of 19 points for Cycle 1 and 17 points for Cycles 2 and 3 (these cycles have one less rubric). Programs are still developing their knowledge and ability to fully support all candidates as they engage in the three CalAPA cycles. COVID presented challenges to working in person and required programs and candidates to switch to a range of instructional settings. To continue to support programs and candidates, the 2020-21 passing score data does indicate that increasing the passing standard from 14 to 16 for Cycle 1, and from 12 to 14 each for cycles 2 and 3 does not lead to significantly decreasing pass rates for all candidates or for subgroups by ethnicity. To take the half step towards reaching the panel-recommended passing standards, Commission staff propose that approximately a -.75 SEM be applied, decreasing from the -1.5 SEM applied in 2019.

Incrementally increasing the passing standard provides programs and candidates additional time to continue developing toward offering programs that provide course work that fully integrates the CAPE and support for the CalAPA, educate faculty, instructors, and supervising personnel, and to develop remediation strategies for candidates who do not pass the CalAPA.

Commission staff and ES will continue to monitor and analyze passing score data in the 2021-22 operational year and conduct a follow-up analysis of pass rate data for the 2022-23 operational year to ensure that moving toward the final recommendation in the future is advisable. Implementing this revised passing standard on January 1, 2022 and then potentially again on January 1, 2023 signals to programs that progress is being made towards achieving the original passing standards as recommended by the panel for beginning administrators completing the CalAPA .

Candidates who have already passed one or two CalAPA cycles will retain their passing status. Only cycle(s) that have not yet been passed as of January 1, 2022 would be held to this revised passing standard. Following the Commission approach for examinations, any revision to the CalAPA passing standard will be implemented moving forward and will not be applied retroactively. Commission staff with ES will revisit submission deadlines to provide candidates the opportunity to receive their scores prior to the change.

Preliminary Administrative Services programs will have the opportunity to continue developing capacity to embed the CalAPA in their course of study and clinical practice expectations for their candidates during the coming years, working toward ensuring all candidates can reach the passing score standards originally recommended by the standard setting panel. Commission and ES staff will continue to offer professional development opportunities for programs through office hours for faculty, instructors, and supervising educators; monthly Virtual Think Tanks designed for program faculty to share candidate support practices; quarterly program coordinator meetings during which data is shared and best practices discussed; and offer deep dive webinars and faculty workshops to examine each CalAPA cycle and set of analytic rubrics. To support candidate data analysis, ES will continue to offer Results Analyzer (an online data analysis program) workshops to support programs to access and study their CalAPA candidate passing score data and provide guidance on how to use data to inform program design. Professional development events offered by Commission and ES staff are typically archived and offered on the Commission's YouTube channel. Understanding the standard setting panel recommendation for future passing score standards encourages programs to assess what and how they need to improve supports for candidates to prepare them in reaching the expectations for performance at the potential future score levels recommended by the standard setting panel of 19, 17 and 17.

Staff Recommendation and Rationale

Staff recommends that the Commission continue to monitor the passing score data for Administrative Services candidates and continue to work toward adoption of the CalAPA Standard Setting Panel's recommendation. An application of a .75 SEM adjustment is recommended starting January 1, 2022 as follows:

- Cycle 1 (8 rubrics): A final cut score of **16 points**
- Cycle 2 (7 rubrics): A final cut score of **14 points**
- Cycle 3 (7 rubrics): A final cut score of **14 points**

Next Steps

If the Commission adopts the standard setting panel's recommended passing scores with applied approximate -0.75 SEM for each cycle effective January 1, 2022, passing standards will be posted on the CalAPA websites and distributed to the field. The passing standard adopted by the Commission will be applied to all candidates as determined by the Commission.

Appendix A

CalAPA Design Team Members

Name	Affiliation
Susan Belenardo	La Habra City Schools, University of California, Irvine
Rebecca Cheung	University of California, Berkeley
Kathy Condren	Madera County Superintendent of Schools
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
Douglas Fisher	San Diego State University
Lanelle Gordin	Riverside County Office of Education
Keith Myatt	California State University, Dominguez Hills
Ursula Reveles	Azusa Pacific University
Kelli Seydewitz	California Teachers Association representative
James Webb	William S. Hart Union High School District
Charles Weis	California State University, Channel Islands

Appendix B

CalAPA Standard-Setting Panel Members

Member	Affiliation
Cheryl Argawal	San Mateo County Office of Education
Susan Belenardo	University of California, Irvine
Leticia Bradley	Santa Barbara County Education Office
Dana Coleman	Loyola Marymount University
Kathy Condren	Madera County Superintendent of Schools
Ardella Dailey	California State University, East Bay
Ellen Edeburn	California State University, Northridge
Delia Estrada	Los Angeles Unified School District
Ursula Estrada-Reveles	Riverside County Office of Education
Toni Faddis	Chula Vista Elementary School District
Charles Flores	California State University, Los Angeles
Joe Frescatore	San Diego County Office of Education
Lanelle Gordin	Riverside County Office of Education
Jason Lea	Sonoma County Office of Education
Maria Montgomery	San Diego Unified School District
Tonikiaa Orange	University of California, Los Angeles
Glenn Sewell	National University
Nichole Walsh	Fresno State University

Appendix C

Detailed Description of the Standard Setting Process for the Redeveloped CalAPA

The CalAPA Standard Setting Study Process

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 threshold, or “passing standard.” The expert educators on the Standard Setting Panel represented CalAPA assessors, CalAPA Design Team members, county office of education administrators, principal mentors/coaches, and administration preparation program faculty who had previously worked with the CalAPA. The names and affiliations of educators who served on the standard setting panels is provided in [Appendix B](#).

As with the standard setting study method used for all other Commission examinations (e.g. CBEST, CSET, CTEL, RICA, CPACE), the process employed for the CalAPA was consistent with recognized psychometric principles and procedures. The standard setting study for the CalAPA was conducted on June 25-26, 2019, with pre-conference activities occurring prior to the meeting.

Prior to the meeting, each invited panelist received CalAPA guides, rubrics, and nine previously scored sample submissions (three from each Cycle) representing different performance levels. Panelists were asked to review materials submitted by candidates and the scoring information for the submissions that were assigned to them prior to arriving at the standard setting. The purpose of the pre-work was to ensure that participants were able to 1) gain some exposure to a range of candidate responses and 2) apply that information in the policy capture activities (activities drawing upon the panelists’ experience and discussion) at the meeting.

The CalAPA standard setting meeting began with an orientation and training session. Panelists were informed of the purpose of the assessment and provided with a briefing book to guide their activities.

Throughout the standard setting event, both a context statement and a guiding question were used and revisited to frame all discussions. This statement and question provided a common framework in which all participants could anchor their decisions:

- Think about an administrator credential candidate who is just at the level of knowledge, skills, and abilities required to perform effectively the job of a new administrator in California public schools.
- Guiding question: What total score (the sum of all rubric scores in the cycle) represents the level of performance achieved by this individual?

Panel members used this concept of what a minimally competent beginning administrator would know and be able to demonstrate in determining their recommended acceptable score for Cycle 1, Cycle 2, and Cycle 3. Although a number of candidates may exceed the level of acceptable knowledge, skills, and abilities, none receiving a passing score should fall below this

minimally competent level. The panel also reviewed the rubrics used to evaluate the cycle steps in the CalAPA.

After this extensive training and the assessment review, panel members completed the following 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 knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for a beginning practitioner just competent to begin professional practice as a public-school administrator.

During the facilitated session, panelists familiarized themselves with the assessment and with the information contained in the briefing book. After a series of policy capture activities, panelists recommended an initial cut score (which may also be referred to as a “passing standard”) for each cycle, which was then reviewed and discussed. Following that, panelists individually recommended a final cut score for each cycle.

Policy Capture 1 Activity Overview/Instructions

In this activity, individuals were assigned in table groups with panelists who had reviewed the same submission for the pre-work assignment. To begin, each panelist individually spent some time recalling the specific submission that they reviewed for the pre-work and then provided an individual rating for that cycle submission (see ratings description that follows), completing an individual rating form for the cycle submission reviewed.

The panelists discussed their ratings with other panelists with the goal of arriving at a consensus table rating. Upon reaching consensus, each table completed one consensus rating form for the cycle submission discussed.

After each table completed the table form, panelists moved to the next table assignment and repeated the process two more times for the other submissions they reviewed for pre-work. By the end of the three cycles, individual ratings and table ratings were generated for each of the cycle submissions reviewed by each individual and group.

This process was completed once for Cycle 1, and again for Cycle 2, and again for Cycle 3, with nine submissions reviewed and discussed by each panelist.

The activities previously described included a rating form with four rating levels from which to select.

Rating Levels	Definitions of Each Rating Level
Clearly below the passing standard	CLEARLY NOT performing effectively the job of a new administrator. This candidate has demonstrated one or more <i>major</i> problems in administrative knowledge, skills, or abilities that require remediation and may need additional time and opportunity for learning and improvement.
Just below the passing standard	APPROACHING but NOT YET effective in performing the job of a new administrator. This candidate has demonstrated some strengths but has one too many issues in administrative knowledge, skills, or abilities that will keep him/her from being effective.
Just meets the passing standard	JUST MEETS your definition of performing effectively the job of a new administrator. This candidate has demonstrated some consistent strengths in administrative knowledge, skills, or abilities and has a foundation on which to build. The candidate may have shown one or more minor flaws in administrative knowledge, skills, or abilities that will likely improve with more time and experience.
Clearly above the passing standard	CLEARLY MEETS your definition of performing effectively the job of a new administrator. This candidate has demonstrated clear strengths in administrative knowledge, skills, and abilities, and a strong foundation for effective administration.

All individual and table ratings were tabulated. Data from the individual ratings of the policy capture activity were then presented to the panel. After some discussion of the individual and table ratings, each table discussed a score range (e.g., a lower and upper bound total score) that may include the potential cut score.

The panel's ratings and review determined that score profiles with a range as follows were appropriate for review and discussion.

- Cycle 1: Total scores between 20-24
- Cycle 2: Total scores between 17-21
- Cycle 3: Total scores between 17-21

Given this range, a set of "Candidate Score Profiles" was reviewed by the panelists. Through Standard Setting Policy Capture 1 and the subsequent discussions, panelists began to come to consensus around a common range within which the passing standard would likely be recommended (from widely divergent to less divergent).

Score Profile Review and Discussion Activity

As part of this activity, panelists reviewed a set of "Candidate Score Profiles" within the total score range between:

- Cycle 1: Total scores between 20-24
- Cycle 2: Total scores between 17-21
- Cycle 3: Total scores between 17-21

The Candidate Score Profiles represented a sample of candidate scores (individual rubric scores and total scores) and the rubric descriptors that correspond to each rubric score. Using only the score profiles and rubric descriptors (i.e., not considering the submission itself), panelists evaluated the score profiles against the common framing of "an administrative services credential candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new administrator in California public schools."

All panelists reviewed the same set of Candidate Score Profiles as a group, for each cycle. The group was asked to review the information to confirm the range of scores within which the passing standard would likely be recommended. Panelists discussed the score profiles and reported out their perception of candidate performance within the upper and lower limits of the score range. Through the Score Profile review and the subsequent discussions, panelists continued to come to consensus around a common range within which the passing standard would likely occur.