



15-DAY NOTICE

DATE:

May 14, 2019

TO:

All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities
of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

FROM:

Mary Vixie Sandy
Executive Director
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

SUBJECT: Notice of Modifications to Proposed Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Administrative Services Credentials

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) conducted a public hearing on February 8, 2019 regarding the proposed amendments to sections 80054 and 80054.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) pertaining to administrative services credentials.

Notice is Hereby Given, pursuant to the requirements of Government Code §11346.8(c) and section 44 of Title 1 of the California Code of Regulations, that the Commission has proposed the following modifications to the text of the proposed regulations. Any person who wishes to comment on the proposed modifications may do so by submitting written comments postmarked beginning May 15, 2019 to May 29, 2019 to the person indicated on the response form attached to this 15-Day Notice.

Note: *Any written comments are to be restricted to the recent modifications to the enclosed language. The Commission is not required to respond to comments received in response to this notice on other aspects of the proposed regulations. All written comments received or postmarked by May 29, 2019 **which pertain to the modified** text of the proposed regulations provided in this notice will be reviewed and responded to by Commission staff as part of the compilation of the rulemaking file.*

Summary of Modifications

The review of the initially proposed amendments by the Office of Administrative Law determined that modifications to the text in the *Administrative Services Credential Program Standards* (rev. 7/2018) document that are incorporated by reference are required for clarity purposes.

Addition of “Cal” Before All References to “APA”

The intent at the time the Commission first took action to require an administrator performance assessment (APA) for issuance of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential was to develop and maintain a single assessment that would be used by all program sponsors. Stakeholder feedback expressed strong support for allowing other

entities (i.e. program sponsors, state agencies, private entities, etc.) to design and administer alternative APAs upon review and approval by the Commission. The Commission took action in [February 2016](#) to allow other entities to design and administer alternative APAs upon Commission approval.

Prior to that action, the Commission had already been seeking to enter into a contract with an assessment developer. In [April 2016](#), the Commission approved a sole source contract with *Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, a business of NCS Pearson, Inc. (Pearson)* to design, develop, and administer the APA, which has been named the “California Administrator Performance Assessment” or CalAPA. The design and development of the CalAPA is complete and the assessment is ready to be implemented.

The addition of “Cal” before all references to “APA” in the program standards is necessary to specify that the CalAPA is the only assessment currently available, thereby clarifying that all candidates in Commission-approved administrative services program will be required to pass the CalAPA as one of the requirements for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

Although other entities may design and develop their own APAs, no such entity has yet expressed an interest in doing so. The design and development process for an APA is a time-consuming process. Commission staff will seek regulation amendments that allow for the acceptance of alternative APAs when/if an entity other than *Pearson* is approved.

Other modifications have also been made to the program standards for clarity and consistency purposes. The modifications to add “Cal” before “APA” throughout the Preliminary Administrative Services Program Standards for the reasons cited above and the other modifications made to the initially proposed programs standards text are detailed below:

Category II: Curriculum

- **Program Standard 6: Preparing Candidates to Master the Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE)**
 - This standard has been modified to include a definition of the CalAPA for clarity purposes and to specify that the assessment is based on the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE).

Category III: Field Experiences in the Program

- **Program Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences:** “Cal” added before “APA” in #1 and #7.

- **Program Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback:**
 - The line in the second paragraph that reads, “The APA is implemented according to the Commission’s requirements” has been deleted. The Commission’s requirements for implementation of the assessment are not included in the program standards and implementation of the assessment is the responsibility of *Pearson* as the current sole entity offering an approved APA.

- “Cal” has been added before “APA” in #1 of the third paragraph and in #1 and #2 of the fourth paragraph.
- “CalAPA” has been added before “activities/cycles” and the text that reads, “...in accordance with the Commission’s requirements” in #2 of the third paragraph has been deleted. The initially proposed text was not clear as it did not define the “Commission’s requirements.” The purpose of this section is to clarify that program sponsors must identify their staff who will be responsible to document their processes for facilitating administration of the assessment and the addition of “CalAPA” is required to specify that the CalAPA is the only assessment currently available.
- **8A: Administration of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA):**
 - “California” has been added before “Administrator” to clarify the name of the currently available assessment and “Cal” has been added before “APA” in the title of this standard
 - **Video:**
 - The word “the” before “video” in bullets #1 and #3 has been modified to “any” for clarity purposes. The information provided in this section specifies the program sponsor’s responsibilities for any video that may be required by the assessment developer.
 - “Cal” has been added before “APA” in bullet #3.
 - **Materials and Data:** “Cal” has been added before “APA” in bullets #4 and #5.
 - **Local Scoring Option:**
 - The term “CalAPA” has been added before “centralized scoring structure” in bullet #7 to clarify that *Pearson*, which is the current sole entity offering an approved APA, is responsible for the scoring of the assessment.
 - The term “CalAPA” has been added before “local scoring option” and the word “Commission” has been modified to “assessment developer” in bullet #8 to clarify that *Pearson*, which is the current sole entity offering an approved APA, is responsible for selecting and training assessors who score candidate responses.
 - “Cal” has been added before “APA” in bullet #8.
- **8B: Candidate Preparation and Support**
 - “Cal” has been added before “APA” in two spots in the first paragraph.
 - The phrase “...Commission-approved administrator performance assessment...” in the first paragraph has been modified to “CalAPA” to specify that the CalAPA is currently the only assessment available.
 - The term “...components consistent with the Commission’s standards and guidelines...” in the last sentence of the first paragraph has been deleted for clarity purposes. Individuals will resubmit the components on which they were not successful to the assessment developer (*Pearson*), not the Commission. The deleted language was not defined within the initially proposed language and *Pearson* is responsible for administering the CalAPA, to include all issues related to scoring of the assessment. In addition, the word “from” following “guidelines” has been modified to “to” for grammatical purposes and the phrase following “from” (now “to”) has been modified from “the developer of the assessment” to “the assessment developer” for consistency purposes with other sections of the proposed program standards that include similar language.

- **#1: Section for “Required” Forms of Support**
 - o “Cal” has been added before “APA” in the title and first three bullets.
 - o The word “a” prefacing “CalAPA” in the third bullet has been modified to “the” for grammatical purposes and to clarify that the CalAPA is currently the only assessment available. The word “a” before “APA” in the initial proposed text implied there was more than one assessment available.
 - **#1: Section for “Acceptable, But Not Required” Forms of Support**
 - o “Cal” has been added before “APA” in the title and first, third, and fourth bullets.
 - o The word “the” before “video” in the sixth bullet has been modified to “any” for clarity purposes. The information provided in this section specifies the program sponsor’s responsibilities for any video that may be required by the assessment developer.
 - **#1: Section for “Unacceptable” Forms of Support**
 - o “Cal” has been added before “APA” in the title and fourth bullet.
 - **#2:** “Cal” has been added before “APA” in this section.
 - **#3:** “Cal” has been added before “APA” and the term “...program only recommends...” has been modified to “...program recommends only...” for clarity purposes.
-
- **8C: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability:**
 - The term “CalAPA” has been added before “centralized scoring structure” in the first sentence of this section to clarify that *Pearson*, which is the current sole entity offering an approved APA, is responsible for the training and selection of CalAPA scorers.
 - “Cal” has been added before “APA” toward the end of the first sentence of this section.
 - The term “Commission’s assessment contractor” in the first sentence has been modified to “Commission’s assessment developer” for consistency purposes with other sections of the proposed program standards that include similar language.
 - The term “CalAPA” has been added before “local scoring structure” in the second sentence of this section to specify the only currently available assessment and the word “a” prefacing the newly added “CalAPA” has been modified to “the” for grammatical purposes.
 - The term “developer of the assessment” at the end of the second sentence has been modified to “assessment developer” for consistency with other sections of the proposed program standards that include similar language.
 - The sentence third sentence that reads, “The selection criteria for all assessors include but are not limited to andragogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the CalAPA” has been deleted, as the assessment developer (*Pearson*) is responsible for the selection of all assessors.
 - The beginning of the fourth sentence in this section that reads, “The developer of the model...” has been amended to “The assessment developer...” for consistency purposes with other sections of the proposed program standards that include similar language. The use of the word “model” in the initially proposed language lacked clarity and implied there is more than one assessment available.
 - The term “assessment developer’s” has been added before “initial training” in the last sentence of this section to clarify that *Pearson*, which is the current sole entity offering an approved APA, is responsible for selecting and training assessors who score candidate responses.

Category IV: Candidate Competence and Performance

• Program Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance

- The term “a Commission-approved” has been modified to “the Cal” before “APA” to specify that the CalAPA is the only assessment currently available.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing 15-Day Notice

February 2016 Commission agenda item 3F – Update on the Alignment of the CAPEs and CPSEL and Proposed Adoption and Approval of Administrator Performance Assessment Design and Program Implementation Standards:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-02/2016-02-3f-pdf>

February 2016 Commission agenda item 3F Insert:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-02/2016-02-3f-insert.pdf>

Approval of February 2016 Minutes:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-04/2016-04-2a-pdf>

April 2016 Commission agenda item 3A – Approval of Contract for Administrator Performance Assessment:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-04/2016-04-3a-pdf>

APA Development Process Graphic (agenda insert for Item 3A):

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-04/2016-04-3a-apa.pdf>

Approval of April 2016 Minutes:

<https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-06/2016-06-1a-pdf>

The entire rulemaking file, including this notice, is available for public inspection at the Commission’s office located at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California, 95811 from May 15, 2019 to May 29, 2019. Please ask for Tammy Duggan or David Crable.

Administrative Services Credential Program Standards

The portions of the program standards document to which the modifications are being made, clearly showing the deleted text in double strikethrough, follows. The text in single underline was already noticed for the 45-day comment period and the public comment period closed on January 7, 2019.

Category II: Curriculum

Program Standard 6: ~~Visionary Leadership~~ Preparing Candidates to Master the Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE)

~~The administrative services preparation program helps the candidate develop an actionable and sustainable vision of teaching and learning that is responsive to the changing context of a given school and local education agency, including the ability to lead others in collaboratively developing, implementing, and evaluating the vision. The program provides multiple opportunities for each candidate to learn, practice, and reflect on visionary leadership as further defined in the adopted Content Expectations and Performance Expectations.~~

The California Administrator Performance Expectations describe the set of professional knowledge, skills and abilities expected of a beginning level practitioner in order to effectively lead a school community in educating and supporting all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

The California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) is an assessment designed to ensure preliminary credential candidates have demonstrated satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the California Administrator Performance Expectations.

The program's organized coursework and clinical practice provide multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on each California Administrator Performance Expectation (CAPE). As candidates progress through the program, pedagogical and andragogical assignments are increasingly complex and challenging. The scope of the pedagogical and andragogical assignments (a) address the CAPE as they apply to the credential, and (b) prepares the candidate for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) and other program-based assessments.

As candidates progress through the curriculum, faculty and other qualified supervisors assess candidates' performance in relation to the CAPE and provide formative and timely performance feedback regarding candidates' progress toward mastering the CAPE.

Category III: Field Experiences in the Program

Program Standard ~~127~~: Nature of Field Experiences

In the administrative services preparation program, candidates participate in practical field experiences that are designed to facilitate the application of theoretical concepts in authentic settings. Each candidate is introduced to the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the administrative services credential as articulated in the [Performance Expectations](#). Field experiences include a variety of diverse and realistic settings both in the day-to-day functions of administrators and in long-term policy design and implementation.

Candidates must complete a range of activities in educational settings. The settings must:

- 1) support the candidate's ability to complete the CalAPA;
- 2) demonstrate commitment to collaborative student-centered practices and continuous program improvement;
- 3) have partnerships with appropriate other educational, social, and community entities that support teaching and learning for all students;
- 4) create a learning culture that supports all students;
- 5) understand and reflect socioeconomic and cultural diversity;
- 6) support the candidate to access data, work with other educators, and observe teaching practice; and
- 7) permit video capture, where designated, for candidate reflection and CalAPA task completion.

Program Standard ~~138~~: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback

The administrative services preparation program sponsor has an effective system by which the candidate's performance is guided, assisted, and evaluated in each field experience. In

this system, at least one field/clinical supervisor and at least one program supervisor provide complete, accurate, and timely feedback to the candidate, including constructive suggestions for improvement.

~~The APA is implemented according to the Commission's requirements.~~

The institution identifies individual program staff responsible for:

- 1) implementing the CalAPA, and
- 2) documenting the administration processes for all CalAPA activities/cycles in accordance with the Commission's requirements.

The program requires all faculty and staff providing instructional and/or supervisory services to candidates within the program to become knowledgeable about:

- 1) the CalAPA cycles, rubrics, and scoring, and
- 2) how the CalAPA is implemented within the program, so that they can appropriately prepare candidates for the assessment and also use CalAPA data for program improvement purposes.

8A: Administration of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA)

Video

- 1) For purposes of implementing the any video requirement, candidates must be able to record interactions with faculty, staff, and PK-12 students.
- 2) The program assures that each school or district where the candidate is completing fieldwork has a media release for all who are videotaped on file.
- 3) The program requires candidates to affirm that the candidate has followed all applicable video policies for the any CalAPA task requiring a video, and maintains records of this affirmation for a full Accreditation cycle.

Materials and Data

- 4) The program assures that candidates understand the appropriate use of materials submitted as part of their CalAPA responses, the appropriate use of their individual performance data, and privacy considerations relating to the use of candidate data.
- 5) The program maintains program level and candidate level CalAPA data, including individual and aggregate results of candidate performance over time, and retains the data for one Accreditation cycle. The program documents the use of these data for Commission reporting, accreditation, and program improvement purposes.

Retake Appeal Process

- 6) All programs have a clearly defined written appeal policy regarding CalAPA retakes and informs candidates about the policy prior to enrollment in the program.

Local Scoring Option

- 7) The program may choose to have their candidate's submission scored by their own calibrated faculty through the CalAPA centralized scoring structure.

- 8) If the program participates in the CalAPA local scoring option, the program coordinates with the ~~Commission~~ assessment developer to identify the local assessors who train and calibrate, who may then score CalAPA submissions from the program's candidates.

8B: 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 ~~Commission-approved administrator performance assessment~~ CalAPA and the passing score standard for the assessment. The program provides multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the CalAPA activities/cycles. The program assures that candidates understand that all responses to the CalAPA submitted for scoring must 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 cycle components ~~consistent with the Commission's standards and guidelines from~~ the assessment developer of the assessment.

- (1) The program implements as indicated below the following support activities for candidates.

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

- Providing candidates with access to assessment guides and other explanatory materials about the CalAPA and expectations for candidate performance on the assessment.
- Explaining CalAPA cycles and scoring rubrics.
- Engaging candidates in formative experiences aligned with ~~at~~ the CalAPA (e.g., analyzing data, facilitating collaborative professional learning, and coaching for improved instruction).
- Providing candidates who are not successful on the assessment with additional support focusing on understanding the cycle(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 CalAPA process:

- Guiding discussions about the CalAPA cycles and scoring rubrics.
- Providing support documents such as advice on making good choices about what to use within the assessment responses.
- Using CalAPA scoring rubrics on assignments outside of the ones the candidate will submit for scoring.
- Asking probing questions about the candidate's draft CalAPA responses, without providing direct edits or specific suggestions about the candidate's work.
- Assisting the candidate in understanding how to use the program's electronic platform in connection with the assessment platform.
- Arranging technical assistance for ~~the~~ any video portion of the assessment.

These activities constitute **unacceptable** forms of support for candidates within the CalAPA 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 the candidate’s responses that indicates alternative responses, prior to submission for official scoring and/or prior to resubmission \(for candidates who are unsuccessful on the assessment\).](#)
 - [Telling a candidate which video clips to select for submission.](#)
 - [Uploading candidate CalAPA responses \(written responses or video entries\) on public access websites, including social media.](#)
- (2) The program provides candidates with timely feedback on formative assessments and experiences in preparation for the CalAPA. The feedback includes information relative to the candidate’s demonstration of competency on the domains of the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE).
- (3) The program provides opportunities for candidates who are not successful on the assessment to receive remedial assistance, to prepare them to retake the assessment. The program ~~only~~ recommends only candidates who have met the passing score on the CalAPA for a preliminary administrative services credential and have met all credential requirements.

8C: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability

The preliminary programs identify potential assessors for the CalAPA centralized scoring option who are then trained, and when calibrated, selected by the Commission’s assessment ~~contractor~~ developer to participate in scoring the CalAPA. For programs electing to use ~~at the~~ CalAPA local scoring option, the program identifies potential assessors based on selection criteria established by the ~~assessment developer of the assessment. The selection criteria for all assessors include but are not limited to andragogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the CalAPA.~~ The assessment developer of the model is responsible for training, calibration and scoring reliability for all assessors in both local and centralized scoring options. All potential assessors must pass the assessment developer’s initial training and calibration prior to scoring and must remain calibrated throughout the scoring process.

Category IV: Candidate Competence and Performance

Program Standard 149: Assessment of Candidate Performance

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

~~assessment processes.~~ The candidate must meet all program requirements for coursework and fieldwork and also pass a Commission approved the CalAPA prior to recommendation for a credential.¹

¹ For 2018-2019 the CalAPA is nonconsequential.



Commission on Teacher Credentialing

1900 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95811 (916) 323-5354 Fax (916) 322-0048 www.ctc.ca.gov

Attn: Tammy A. Duggan, Consultant
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Title: Notice of Modifications to Proposed Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining Administrative Services Credentials

Sections: 80054 and 80054.1

Response to the Attached Regulations

If you disagree with the new proposed changes within the attached Title 5 Regulations, please return this response form to the Commission office, attention Tammy A. Duggan, at the above address or fax to her attention at (916) 322-0048. Written comments may also be sent via email to tduggan@ctc.ca.gov. All written comments must be received or postmarked no later than May 29, 2019.

No, I do not agree with the new proposed changes to the Title 5 Regulations for the following reasons (If additional space is needed, use the reverse of this sheet or additional page):

Personal opinion of the undersigned

Organizational opinion representing: (Circle One)

School District, County Schools, College/University, Professional Organization,
Other _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Route to TAD