Program Update Q&A

Below are answers to the questions asked in the chat window during the CalAPA Program Update Webinar on October 18, 2017.

Cycles & Rubrics

Can the individual tasks within the various cycles be done simultaneously, but submitted at a later time of the year, e.g., hold a meeting to analyze data for Cycle 2 while the candidate is also completing the activities for Cycle 1?

Yes, the various cycle tasks can be done simultaneously and submitted on different dates. The intention was to design tasks that measure different constructs in each cycle, but that doesn't necessarily preclude candidates from simultaneously completing tasks across cycles, e.g., what you find in your equity gap analysis in Cycle 1 could conceivably inform your community of practice in Cycle 2, but that is not expected, nor required.

Are four separate narratives required, or can the Investigate, Plan, Act, and Reflect be part of one submission?

Candidates will need to download and complete separate templates for each of the written narratives that are required for each cycle. These templates can be worked on offline. Then candidates will need to log back into the system to upload their completed templates either one at a time or all at once, according to their preference.

Regarding the Reflection tasks, will candidates be penalized if they express their vulnerability or suggest that they need much more work in these specific areas?

No, the intent is for the candidates to be as honest as possible about where they perceive they need to build their skills. The rubrics are designed to affirm and support entry level administrator skills as well as demonstrate pathways for improving those skills over time. Recognizing where they need to improve makes them a productive and reflective practitioner.

Do candidates need to have district, site, teacher, and student consent for each cycle?

Candidates must acquire consent for any students or adults whom they capture on video. If a school district already collects parental consent for video recording of its students as a standard practice, the candidate does not need to acquire additional consent.

Do the candidates need to submit consent forms?

No, candidates do not need to submit consent forms, but they or the school district should retain them in the event they are requested at a later date.

For Cycle 1, is the stakeholder feedback about the feasibility of the strategies aligned with the focus area or specific to the communication of the strategies to the stakeholders?
Both. We want to see the candidates' thinking about how they would apply what they have learned through their data analysis and how they would reach out to and work with others to implement those strategies to address the equity gap.

For Cycle 1, will the stakeholder group be defined (parents, teachers, etc.)?
Because stakeholder groups will vary by clinical practice placement and situation, we did not set any arbitrary constraints. Candidates may identify whatever stakeholder(s) they deem appropriate given the gap analysis.

For Cycle 1, can you provide some examples of what you are looking for in terms of qualitative data sources for three years?
Candidates should determine where the quantitative data set is leading, and then come back to collect local qualitative data that can back it up, e.g., pre-existing or candidate-generated surveys and interviews of students, faculty, and/or the larger school community.

For Cycle 2, can you provide examples of what is meant by educational focus? How broad, e.g., ELA?
The educational focus can encompass a wide range of topics, e.g., instructional issues, concerns about how assessments are conducted at the school, how student well-being is supported through policies on issues such as bullying. The decision to choose a particular area of focus must be based on data findings from the school site.

For Cycle 2, could the [community of practice] be the existing instructional leadership team or a department?
Yes.

For Cycle 2 Rubric 2.6, is the thinking that the candidate would be doing much of the facilitation or building the capacity of the group to facilitate themselves?
The high end of this rubric is about co-facilitation. Ideally, candidates should be moving toward having the capacity to let others in the group co-facilitate.

For Cycle 2 Rubric 2.7, please explain what you mean by using initial results to improve their leadership.
Presumably, as the group continues to meet, they are also starting to implement the strategies they have identified, and the intent is for them to understand and document the impact those strategies are having.

For Cycle 3, are counselor candidates able to coach a counselor as opposed to a teacher?
No, candidates have to be able to demonstrate their ability to observe and coach a classroom teacher. The Commission has determined that the preliminary administrator credential is focused on school building capacity and the leadership required to lead and support that school's faculty and

community of learners, i.e., the role of school principal. Cycle 3 is about observing instruction and providing coaching to a teacher based on the CSTPs.

For Cycle 3, our teacher evaluation system follows other indicators aligned to the CSTPs. Should candidates use the CSTP language vs. our evaluation system language?
Yes, candidates are expected to use the CSTP language. If other indicators are used, e.g. the Danielson Model, they must be translated into the CSTP.

For Cycle 3, aren't the video clips of the pre- and post-conferences, not the lesson observation itself?
The candidates are not required to submit the video of the lesson observation, but they will use the recording to analyze the volunteer teacher's performance and prepare for the post-observation meeting.

For Cycle 3 Rubric 3.1, are candidates looking at the current role of teacher coaching at the school from a teacher coaching perspective or from a leadership/administrator perspective?
Both. Cycle 3 explores the role of the administrator in supporting teacher growth and development. The intent is for candidates to develop a thorough understanding of what is happening at the school site before they engage in the coaching, e.g., conducting a series of interviews, exploring observation tools that have been used in the past, understanding the role of coaching at the school and the degree to which it has been experienced by the volunteer teacher.

How can we get access to preview the cycles & rubrics if we are not participating in the field test?
Program coordinators from approved educator preparation programs may request access to CalAPA Field Test materials by emailing es-calapa@pearson.com and share the materials with their faculty/staff who will be involved in implementing the CalAPA in future years.

CalAPA Platform

How will the CalAPA system work?
The CalAPA will feature an online submission system with an integrated video annotation tool. Candidates will upload prepared written evidence and video clips to the system, and then annotate their video clips within the system.

Once operational in fall 2018, candidates will register for each cycle separately. There will be an established, year-round submission schedule with scores reported within three weeks of each submission deadline. Scoring will be centralized and online with an option for programs to request local scoring (see Scoring below). Scoring results will be distributed electronically to candidates and programs, with programs having access to individual candidate, aggregated program, and statewide data via the *ResultsAnalyzer* reporting system.

Are there instructions on how to annotate the videos? What technology is required?
The CalAPA online submission system will feature an integrated video annotation tool. There will be detailed instructions and online tutorials to support candidates in using the system.

Will external platforms such as GoReact from which candidates can upload video be compatible with the website, or must candidates utilize the technologies provided by the website?

Video evidence files must conform to one of the acceptable formats specified in the cycle evidence charts, e.g., .mp4, .mov. Candidates will upload their video files to the CalAPA platform and apply their annotations using the platform annotation tool. It will not be possible to create annotations outside of the system.

Candidate Support

What kind of new program supports will the CalAPA require?

Beyond initial implementation considerations such as course/catalogue revisions, embedding fees, remediation policies, etc., each program will be required to identify a **CalAPA coordinator** to serve as the point person responsible for keeping up with CalAPA requirements and communications from the CTC, disseminating information to program faculty and staff, and receiving candidate results.

Is the formative feedback going to be provided starting this year, and are candidates going to have the opportunity to resubmit?

For the field test, candidates will not receive formative feedback; however, programs will receive aggregated program and statewide performance data. For the non-consequential year of 2018-2019, candidates will receive feedback after each cycle submission, but it will not be necessary for candidates to resubmit any cycles. When the CalAPA becomes required in 2019-2020, candidates will need to meet a passing standard for each of the three cycles. Candidates who do not pass a cycle will need to resubmit that cycle. A standard setting study will be conducted in spring of 2019, and passing standards will be adopted by the CTC.

Scoring

Is a 3 on the rubric considered competency met?

Level 3 was initially designed as the base level response to the essential questions, i.e., level 3 includes everything the essential questions ask for, but it is yet to be determined if that will be the final standard. Final standards will be set after the non-consequential year has concluded in spring 2019.

Is there a passing score for each rubric as well as an overall passing score for the whole cycle? Are they weighted? For example, are the Act rubrics weighted more heavily than the Reflect rubrics?

While the rubrics themselves are not weighted, the distribution of rubrics across the various steps in each cycle effectively weights some steps more than others. It is expected that the cycles will follow a compensatory scoring model that will allow higher scores on some rubrics to compensate for lower scores on others; however, the degree of allowable compensation and the overall minimum passing threshold for each cycle will not be determined until after the non-consequential year. Once consequential, candidates will have to meet the minimum passing standard for all three cycles.

Will candidates need to pass Cycle 1 before continuing on to Cycles 2 and 3?
The cycles were designed to follow a natural formative progression from Cycle 1 to Cycle 3, but it is not necessary to complete or pass them in order. Once operational, it will be recommended for candidates to wait to receive feedback on a cycle before submitting the next one.

What is the turnaround time for candidate feedback?
Once operational, candidates will receive results within three weeks of the submission deadline for the window in which they submitted.

How and when will scoring take place?
Once assessors have been trained and calibrated, they will score submissions online via a secure portal. Field test assessor training and calibration will be face-to-face in early May followed by online scoring throughout the remainder of the month. For operational implementation, training and calibration will be conducted online.

Will candidates know their score during the non-consequential year?
Candidates will receive feedback during the non-consequential year, but the extent of that feedback is yet to be determined.

How will programs receive scoring results?
Programs will be able to access scoring results via Pearson's *ResultsAnalyzer* reporting system.

How much will assessors be paid per cycle?
A final assessor rate will be determined after field test scoring is complete.

How does the local scoring option work?
Programs may opt to have their candidates' submission scored by local assessors. Local assessors are technically part of the centralized scoring pool. All assessors, both centralized and local, will be recruited and trained through centralized scoring. Programs will not be required to train, recruit, or pay assessors.

If the local scoring option is chosen, is centralized scoring still required?
For programs that choose the local scoring option, centralized scoring will remain as a backup for instances when local scoring is not possible, e.g., when the local site has more submissions than their local assessors can process within the three week scoring window.

Is there a difference in cost between the local and centralized scoring options?
There is no difference in cost between the local and centralized scoring options. All assessors, both centralized and local, will be paid at the same rate, and all scoring costs will be covered by the assessment fees paid by candidates.

How can we form a local scoring pool from here onward?
During program onboarding in spring/summer 2018, programs will have the opportunity to request the local scoring option. Programs interested in the local scoring option are encouraged to have their

assessors apply to score for the field test and non-consequential year so they may become familiar with the process.

If we previously applied to score for the pilot do we need to reapply to score for the field test, non-consequential year, and/or operational administration?
No, once you're in the Pearson system you do not need to reapply.

Operational Transition

How will the non-consequential administration year work?
During the non-consequential year, programs will be required to embed the cycles within their curriculum and candidates will be required to submit all three cycles, but candidates will not be required to meet a minimum standard. The *ResultsAnalyzer* reporting system will track your candidates and document who has successfully submitted and completed the three cycles.

Will candidates be expected to retake a cycle if they do not pass it during the non-consequential year?
No, the passing standards will not be determined until the conclusion of the non-consequential year so candidates completing the cycles during the non-consequential year will not be required to meet a passing standard or retake any cycles. Passing standards will not be retroactively applied to the non-consequential year.

Does the non-consequential year apply just to the CalAPA, or does it apply to the CalTPA as well?
The non-consequential year only applies to the CalAPA. The revised CalTPA will become operational and consequential in 2018-2019. Teacher candidates beginning programs as of July 1, 2018 are required to take and pass a redeveloped TPA that measures the revised TPEs.

Will there be a cost to candidates for the non-consequential year (2018-2019)? How about subsequent years (2019 and beyond)? How much will it be?
There will be no fee to candidates for the non-consequential year. Costs for the non-consequential year will be covered by the CTC. Starting in fall 2019, the total fee for all three cycles will be $425 (the exact fee per cycle has not yet been established).

Will the fee need to be paid by the candidate or the program?
Starting in fall 2019, candidates will be required to pay the fee for each cycle when they register. Programs will have the option to purchase registration vouchers to distribute to candidates and embed the cost of the CalAPA within their tuition. Each candidate will register online for the CalAPA and pay the fee or use the voucher provided by the program.