

INVITED COMMENTARY

**CAPEA's Continuing Commitment to Equity:
Collective Action on CCTC Initiatives**

Peg Winkelman
California State University, East Bay

Noni Mendoza-Reis
San José State University

This article chronicles CAPEA's efforts to collectively advocate for equity-centered leadership preparation. The 2013 CAPEA journal featured an article by members' describing the organization's commitment to equity and cultural competency in leadership preparation. This article reports on efforts since 2013, a time of substantial changes in administrator certification from leadership preparation program portfolios to state-mandated performance assessments. We offer this historical perspective of CAPEA's commitment to social justice leadership preparation in California.

Keywords: equity-centered leadership preparation, educational leadership assessments, coalition building, advocacy, collectivism and activist organizations, dedication to social justice.

In the spring and summer of 2013, Peg was honored to join members of the Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice Committee of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA), Franca Dell'Olio, Albert Jones, Susan Jindra, Linda Jungwirth, Delores B. Lindsey, Randall B. Lindsey, Philip Mirci, Linda Purrington, Thelma Moore-Steward, Chris Thomas, Cheryl Ward, and Don Wise, as they chronicled CAPEA's collective work to move from an organization that lacked a significant number of diverse members and perspectives to an organization "committed to equity and cultural competency." The journal, published in the fall of 2013, captured "a newfound direction, passion, and commitment in a quest for equity to be 'the innovators of change in practice' focused on creating social justice leaders."

CAPEA continues to develop a community of praxis to lead for social justice throughout the state. The collective actions of our members have influenced policy and practices in higher education institutions as well as district, county, and state offices of education. As scholar-practitioners we not only contribute to a body of research dedicated to the disruption of systemic inequities, we take action. Our belief is that achieving equity in education requires more than advocacy. It requires efforts of activism and moral courage to advocate for the educational rights of California's diverse student population.

As scholars who research leadership and social justice, we have ample evidence that without an intentional, relentless focus on anti-racist, critical praxis, the educational system will continue to produce inequitable outcomes. This article provides a snapshot of CAPEA's collaborative work with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to guide the preparation of leaders who will better serve California's diverse student population. CAPEA's mission drives us to deliberately disrupt and dismantle educational practices that perpetuate the historic and systemic denial of educational opportunities. CAPEA members are compelled to dedicate time and apply a critical lens to the articulation of all policies and practices pertaining to leadership preparation and development. CAPEA members consistently contribute to a variety of venues that facilitate statewide collaboration, including: CCTC Think Tanks, webinars, surveys, office hours, work groups, conferences, and commission meetings. CAPEA's responses to the CCTC regarding authentic assessment, professional standards and performance expectations, coaching for equity, fieldwork, and the role of program providers in the design, development, and monitoring of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), shape the nature of preparation and support of leaders throughout the state.

CAPEA's efforts reflect our members' understanding of systems and organizational theories and scholarship. In addition to teaching courses on these theories, we have experiential knowledge in leading educational organizations. We are scholars of educational leadership. Our experiential and research knowledge guides our enactment of community organizing principles. On their website, the National Education Association (NEA) notes, "a culture of organizing is one that promotes deep member engagement, leadership development, and collective action. At its core, organizing means facilitating collective action among a group and empowering others to take on leadership roles." We would add that organizing for social justice requires persistence and patience as activism takes time and requires coalition-building through shared interests. We offer this story to convey some of the ways CAPEA members walk our equity talk as we steadfastly immerse ourselves in statewide work to influence policy and practice. This is a narrative of persistence and resistance in the name of social justice. We share the story of how a small organization can make change when we do not waiver from our vision, and choose to live the principles of community organizing. More importantly, this journey exemplifies how educational leadership programs can move beyond advocacy to activism.

We begin our narrative with descriptions of CAPEA’s organized responses to information and action items on the CCTC meetings in the fall of 2013. We share how CAPEA members pursue anti-racist, abolitionist leadership through aligned initiatives which we address in the following sections: Advocating for Authentic Assessments of Equity-Driven Leadership: Not the Connecticut Administrator Test; Coaching, Professional Learning, and Assessment: Getting Explicit about Equity; Aligning Standards and Centering Equity: Not a Laundry List; Framing Administrative Expectations to Explicitly Serve Diverse Student Populations: Beyond the “All Students” Statement; and Inserting Scholar-Practitioner Leaders for Social Justice in the Design, Implementation and Monitoring of the CalAPA.

Advocating for Authentic Assessments of Equity-Driven Leadership: Not the Connecticut Administrator Test

In the fall of 2013, CAPEA members attend the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) meeting and learn that legislation has been passed that requires the adoption of an Administrator Performance Assessment, parallel to the Teacher Performance Assessment, (EdTPA). At the CCTC meeting, the item under consideration is for California to adopt the Connecticut Administrator Test. CCTC staff as well as the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) representatives are scheduled to travel to Connecticut to learn more about the proposed assessment. At the time, CAPEA members are unaware of the proposal and are not invited to the demonstration sessions in Connecticut. However, as we quickly recognize the implications of an administrator assessment, we mobilize our membership and a significant number of CAPEA members attend a subsequent Connecticut Administrator Test webinar on November 4, 2013. The webinar documents, the Candidate Registration Bulletin/Study Guide for the Connecticut Administrator Test, and an Alignment of Connecticut Administrator Performance Expectations to the California Administrator Performance Expectations, are then forwarded to all CAPEA members for comment. Based on the collective comments of CAPEA members we submit a letter to the commission. In the letter we acknowledge the similarities across the Connecticut Leadership Standards and the California Administrator Performance Expectations (under consideration at that time). We outline the collective concerns raised by CAPEA members that the “Connecticut Administrator Test is a test, not an authentic performance assessment” and that “the carefully constructed scenarios fail to capture the essential skills and competencies that preparation programs expect of leaders.” We provide a detailed critique of the Connecticut Administrator Test sample materials including the excerpts below:

In the elementary sample module, applicants are provided with the pre- and post-conference questions and responses. In an authentic assessment, an applicant would be expected to review the lesson, determine objectives for the post observation conference, develop reflective questions, and be prepared to share evidence of promising practice as well as identify areas for improvement... The prompts for response and the sample responses are contextually problematic. The actual provision of such extensive, yet disjointed, feedback to a teacher would not meet the standard of effective professional learning or instructional support in an applied program. The sample passing responses offered detailed diagnoses of the lesson (including a suggestion about adopting a token economy discipline system), but failed to address a key component of the common core mathematics standards.

The high school sample module offered an opportunity for candidates to reflect upon multiple data sources, but again did not assess the capacity of a leader to collect and analyze data, or prepare agendas and questions for stakeholders to address. The sample module did not offer candidates the opportunity to navigate differing perspectives in order to arrive at actions that best serve students. An authentic assessment would require candidates to provide evidence of meetings and initiatives candidates have actually led.

It is worth noting that the inadequacies CAPEA members identify in the Connecticut Administrator Test later become critical considerations in the development of the CalAPA. While CAPEA opposes the proposed adoption, we make a commitment to collaborate on the design of an assessment that will align with our vision and values.

The Connecticut Administrator Test does not adequately address performance expectations for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential applicants who complete programs. As an organization of professors committed to developing quality leaders, we cannot support the dedication of financial and personnel resources to this test. While we are unable to support the proposed instrument as a performance assessment for programs, we are able to offer our support of an authentic alternative.

It is important to note the application of some key elements in organizing deep member engagement. CAPEA Members are consistently kept informed of all communication with the CCTC, and their input is sought. At the time of these efforts, we communicated through monthly newsletter and just-in-time emails. The elements of leadership development and collective action are evident as more and more CAPEA members begin to contribute to these discussions, and take proactive roles in their respective leadership preparation programs.

In public comments at the December 12, 2013 CCTC meeting, CAPEA members provide persuasive evidence to dissuade the commission from taking immediate action on the adoption of the Connecticut Administrator Test for program candidates. CCTC staff are directed to review and modify CAT items for a potential pilot, but ultimately the commission choose not to move forward on the adoption of the CAT.

The subsequent PSC 3B -2 December 2014 posting reflects a significant change in direction by the CCTC:

The development of the program route APA presents an exciting opportunity to potentially push the boundaries of the field. The fact that there is presently no available job-situated APA in the nation, except for one still under development by Massachusetts, is testament to the difficulty and complexity of this type of examinations development.

CAPEA letters and testimonies to the CCTC set in motion this initiative to “push the boundaries of the field” in the design of an authentic performance assessment. Beyond the goal of examining “job-situated” tasks, CAPEA continuously frames school leadership in terms of working towards more just and equitable learning experiences for a diverse student population.

Examining Coaching, Professional Learning, and Assessment: Getting Explicit about Equity

At the February 12, 2014 CCTC meeting another action item (6C) is presented to offer “an overall

direction” as to the Program Standards for the Administrative Services Credential Clear Induction Programs. The proposal includes three intersecting elements: coaching, professional learning, and assessment. CAPEA’s letter to the CCTC challenges the degree to which each of these elements might validate an induction model that would simply inculcate a new leader through indoctrination into the accepted practices of a school and district. For instance, critical reflection must focus not merely on individual actions, but on actions and policies that sustain systemic oppression. Our response is as follows:

We applaud the coaching requirement to “implement a research-based model, with a sound rationale, that meets the individual needs of beginning administrators”. The exemplars clearly describe the importance of “confidential” and “non-evaluative” support. The relationship between coaches and district administrators must be thoughtfully delineated, as it was with BTSA coaches, to promote the optimal learning conditions for new leaders. It is critical that this opportunity for reform be used NOT to perpetuate an apprenticeship model (“do as I do”), but to thoroughly prepare leaders for today’s schools. The description of the coaching process supports an ongoing cycle of critical reflection and adaptation.

CAPEA rejects the notion of organizational neutrality and recognizes the systemic tendency to maintain and sustain leadership practices that perpetuate the marginalization of student populations. This recognition includes explicitly addressing equity issues in coaching as well as professional learning:

We assume that every professional learning option is research-based and that the conceptual frame and research underlying the practice will be shared with the candidate. Too often educators are “trained” to implement current practices without developing an understanding of why a practice was developed and how it can be effectively implemented... There is a difference between attending a “how-to” meeting on master scheduling (which should be considered an extension of coaching) and working on the question of how to develop pathways for English Language Learners who are unintentionally, but systemically, excluded from STEM and other curricular elective options... It is critical that new leaders be engaged in professional learning that not only improves their current practices, but also perpetuates professional inquiry throughout their careers.

CAPEA advocates for the potential role of new activist leaders in schools and districts, who, as scholar-practitioners, will mobilize ongoing equity-focused inquiry.

This (professional learning) is a critical component in supporting not only the development of the individual candidate but also the improvement of the educational system that the leader serves. Just as beginning teachers regenerate the practice of their colleagues with current research-based pedagogy, new leaders revitalize sites and districts with their praxis.

CAPEA addresses the intersecting elements of induction: coaching, professional learning, and assessment that will influence leaders’ praxis throughout their careers.

We commend the assessment process design that engages “the candidate in gathering

evidence of his/her own leadership practice, promotes reflection, documents candidate learning and leadership impact, and identifies next steps.” This cycle of inquiry and continuous improvement should be initiated in preparation programs and sustained throughout an administrator’s tenure in the profession... CPSELs may also be used as a professional learning tool for administrators who have completed their clear credential. District administrators report that it is helpful to share a common language and expectations.

CAPEA lauds the induction assessment design because the process of evidence-gathering and reflection aligns with the practice of ongoing inquiry. CAPEA’s vision is that leadership inquiries should be intentional and specifically address service to underserved student populations. CAPEA members contribute this equity lens to each refreshed standard and thus CAPEA also proposes that the newly revised CPSEL be used as part of the evaluation process for veteran administrators as well as new leaders.

At a working meeting on March 14, 2014 CAPEA members examine the CCTC initiatives on leadership preparation and determine a need to concretize the expression of leadership for equity and name the work. Two motions are put forth: (1) CAPEA will continue to examine and discuss performance assessments of credential candidates; and (2) CAPEA will promote culturally relevant and responsive coaching models. Both actions are unanimously approved. In response to the second proclamation, the CAPEA Board considers the leadership coaching offerings provided by larger state and national organizations and finds that issues of inequity are addressed tangentially, as separate modules, not central concerns. We call upon the expertise of our CAPEA members, Delores Lindsey, Ken Magdalono, and Keith Myatt, who constructed CAPEA’s Coaching-for-Equity Model. Cultural Proficiency is, and continues to be, used as a conceptual framework for examining issues of equity and access related to the leadership standards (Lindsey, Martinez & Lindsey, 2006; Lindsey, Martinez, Lindsey & Myatt, 2019). CAPEA Coaches fine-tune their coaching strategies, while practicing reflection, dialogue, and goal setting with candidates. Coaches learn protocols for observing, providing feedback, and assessing candidates through an assets-based approach that ensures candidates’ continued growth over time. Coaches model and discuss cultural competency with their leadership candidates to instill an equity frame, a lens to apply to every administrative action. The articulation of an overarching and consistent commitment to equity-minded leadership guides to this day CAPEA’s responses to all components of leadership preparation.

Aligning Standards and Centering Equity

The revision of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, CPSEL, is another action item brought to the commission at the same time as the APA in 2013. CAPEA members who serve on the revision work group carefully consider the language used to depict leadership practices that support transformation, versus terms that designate management skills that will maintain a static and inequitable system. They focus on assets-based approaches to student learning, discipline, and community involvement. Proposed revisions are distributed to the larger CAPEA membership and comments are incorporated in the final version. In a February 9, 2014, CAPEA letter to the commission regarding the adoption of the updated California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, CPSEL, CAPEA explicitly remind the CCTC of our commitment to equity and social justice. Grounded in the refreshed CPSEL (not CAPE) language,

CAPEA offers a shared-goal statement for consideration in the assessment design to better serve underserved student populations that we find critical to incorporate: use of multiple data sources, including student attendance and discipline data, to develop and monitor school plans; research-based professional learning; leveraging of community resources to meet student needs; examination of personal and institutional biases to remove barriers that create educational disadvantage; understanding of social, cultural, economic, and political context to shape policies to improve educational and career opportunities for all students.

In public comments to the commission at the February 12, 2014 meeting, CAPEA members not only support the approval of the revised CPSEL, they ask that the CCTC use the CPSEL to review the latest version of the California Administrator Performance Expectations, CAPE, and to use a refreshed CPSEL/CAPE alignment to frame the design of a California Administrator Performance Assessment, Cal APA. CAPEA members again note that the proposed connections across the current Connecticut Leadership Standards and the California Administrator Performance Expectations fail to capture the critical need to prepare and support the ongoing development of leaders who will have the capacity to better serve California's diverse student population.

In October of 2015, the CCTC address the recommendation offered by CAPEA on February 12, 2014:

In anticipation of the opportunity to move forward with an APA, the Commission's Performance Assessment Work Group (one of the work groups working on the effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system) developed draft Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards and related APA Program Implementation Standards for Commission consideration. A draft of these standards was presented to the Commission at its April 2015 meeting: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-04/2015-04-4C.pdf>. Commissioners directed staff to revise the draft standards, engage in discussion with stakeholders, and return with a revised draft for consideration and possible adoption. (EPC 2F-3 October 2015)

Through the process of composing and advocating for revisions to each of the California Professional Educational Leadership Standards, CPSEL, CAPEA identifies an imperative to frame the CPSEL and the CAPE with a direct assertion that leaders will commit to providing educational opportunities, and more equitable service, to all students. Noting that districts and schools throughout the state use the phrase "all students" in vision and mission statements, CAPEA proposes clarifying the description of "all students" in order to move forward with more inclusive practices.

Framing Administrative Expectations to Explicitly Serve Diverse Student Populations: Beyond the "All Students" Statement

At the June 13, 2016 CCTC meeting, CAPEA respond to Action Item 2C with appreciation as well as a call to activism.

On behalf of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA), we want to acknowledge the Commission for consistently responding to recommendations from the field of educational leadership (CAPEA) concerning the

California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) and the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL). We also wish to recognize Karen Kearney's considered facilitation in developing descriptors of practice for the CPSEL. At this stage in the adoption of standards that will frame the Administrator Performance Assessment (APA), we want to appreciate the teamwork of CTC staff including Director Mary Sandy, Amy Reising, and Gay Roby who have worked closely with program providers to develop shared language to align the CAPEs and CPSEL.

As we consider item 2C, Adoption of the Revised California Administrator Performance Expectations, we applaud the thoughtful work conducted to more clearly align the CAPEs with the work of preliminary candidates and to provide a more coherent transition to the CPSEL. While we note that there are references to equity throughout the CAPE/CPSEL document (including the 2C agenda insert), we recognize the commission's deep commitment to equity and provide a recommendation based on the stated values of the commission.

In recognition of the Commission's values and honoring the commitment of educational leadership program providers to prepare administrators who lead for equity and work to close the opportunity gap for students in California, we recommend that the Commission adopt a guiding statement as a preamble to the CAPEs and CPSEL. This statement should clearly communicate the responsibility of administrators to lead for equity.

Prior to the June 13, 2016 meeting, CAPEA members review several sources including the National Policy Board for Educational Administration's Professional Standards for Educational Leaders; they offer a preamble draft to clearly frame the expectation that administrators will lead for equity. The proposal includes the phrase that "educational leaders confront and alter institutional biases of student marginalization, deficit-based schooling, as well as low expectations associated with race, class, culture and language, gender and sexual orientation, and disability or special status; they also address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership".

Several CAPEA members address the commission in support of the proposed preamble. They speak of the need to confront marginalizing practices, the necessity of identifying what is meant by "all students," and the imperative to convert vision statements into policies that will guide the development as well as assessment of leaders throughout the state. In response to CAPEA's proposal, Linda Darling Hammond asks for a recess from the meeting. After the commission's recess, she offers a few edits and additions to CAPEA's draft statement. She reads a revised statement and makes a motion to provide the following preamble as an introduction to the CAPE:

Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student's academic success and well-being. California leaders recognize, respect, and employ each student's strengths, experiences, and culture as assets for teaching and learning. Effective educational leaders confront and alter institutional biases of student marginalization, deficit based schooling, and low expectations associated with race, class, culture and language, gender and sexual orientation, and disability or special status to support the learning of every child.

Throughout this set of CAPEs, reference is made to “all students” or “all TK-12 students.” This phrase is intended as a widely inclusive term that references all students attending public schools. Students may exhibit a wide range of learning and behavioral characteristics, as well as disabilities, dyslexia, intellectual or academic advancement, and differences based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, and/or geographic origin. The range of students in California public schools also includes students whose first language is English, English learners, and Standard English learners. This inclusive definition of “all students” applies whenever and wherever the phrase “all students” is used in the CAPEs.

This action is unanimously approved by the CTC with a comment thanking “the field” for our (CAPEA’s) engagement throughout a three-year process to adopt leadership standards and expectations that will inform the direction of preparation and induction programs, as well as the design of the CalAPA.

At the end of June, Gay Roby sends the ASC Handbook, dated 2016 to differentiate from its predecessor. The new handbook is posted on the CTC website on the Administrator Preparation page, as well as the standards page. CAPEA members note that most of the changes adopted are based on CAPEA’s consistent and comprehensive input, including CAPEA's letter proposing an equity preamble to the standards.

Inserting Scholar-Practitioner Leaders for Social Justice in the Design, Implementation, and Monitoring of the CalAPA

CAPEA's social justice commitment to preparing staunch leaders for ALL the students of California supports members' advocacy work through the three-year process leading to the adoption of APA design standards. However, the activism work continues through a sustained commitment to actively participate in the design and implementation of an administrator performance assessment. This activism includes a demand that program providers be included in all steps of the design and implementation process:

On behalf of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA), we offer the following response to item 3F. At the fall conference, CAPEA members appreciated the sessions offered by CTC staff members Amy Reising and Gay Roby. We were also pleased that many of us were able to participate in the stakeholder meetings on November 5th and 9th. While we note that the revised APA design standards reflect many of the suggestions offered in the CAPEA letter sent to CTC staff on November 16th, the action steps proposed in item 3F do not reflect the action steps CAPEA requested in letters to the commission and comments at the October 8th & 9th and December 3rd meetings. Members participated in the CAPE/CPSEL meeting on January 7th and coordinated the venue for sharing performance assessments on January 15th. Based on considered deliberation, CAPEA’s objection to 3F is based on the omission of specific directives to include program providers throughout the APA implementation process including: designing, piloting, and revising tasks as well as developing exemplar responses for calibration purposes.

In all references to “model sponsor” under the Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness from 1(c) through 1(m); under Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness 2(b) through 2(i); and under Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 3: APA Assessment Sponsor Support Responsibilities 3(a) through 3(c), we ask that the phrase “with a design team of program providers” be added.

In oral comments to the commission in support of this written request, CAPEA notes that program providers have the expertise, research background, and field experience to support the development of an authentic assessment that will irradiate equity-driven leadership practices. We remind the commission that it was program providers who reviewed the Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT) two years ago and uncovered critical issues in the exemplar candidate responses. Basing preliminary performance expectations on the CPSELs and including program providers in the development of the assessment (1) provides new leaders with a coherent professional learning experience, and (2) strengthens the professional learning community among program providers. Both recommendations will improve the preparation of administrators. CAPEA’s recommendations are consistent with direction provided to CTC staff at the December Commission meeting to proceed with the following steps: (1) that the CAPEs and CPSELs be reviewed to create a set of comprehensible performance criteria for emerging leaders to guide the APA and inform the assessment of new administrators in the induction program; (2) that the Commission adopt the draft APA Assessment Design and Program Implementation Standards with direction to CTC staff that program providers be included in every stage of the development and implementation process.

Without CAPEA’s amendments, the approval of the 3F action item presents not only a missed opportunity to draw upon the expertise of program providers, but also poses a potential threat to the development of professional practice throughout the state. We remind the Commission that two years ago CAPEA’s review of an exam that met all criteria regarding alignment to state professional standards as well as reliability and validity measures, failed to meet the critical component of addressing best practice in leadership and teaching to better serve students. Program providers who have a research background in curriculum and instruction as well as adult learning theory would not have approved the exemplar candidate response to the teacher observation task on the Connecticut Administrator Test.

CAPEA also reiterates to the Commission an offer we first made in our October 2015 letter:

As an organization representing public and private administrative preparation programs throughout the State, we offer our participation in the design and implementation of an authentic performance assessment. We have the capacity to support the development of rubrics, sample artifacts, and calibration. We have already dedicated our time and resources to the enactment of the Commission’s directives... As an organization, CAPEA continues to offer our support of the APA initiative. We look forward to hearing from members who will participate in the design team and we will continue to offer venues for the development, piloting, and implementation of this important assessment work.

Commissioners unanimously approve the action item with the recommendations provided by CAPEA. A design team is appointed by the commission and they begin a two year process to design leadership tasks that align with the critical work of leading for social justice. Visionary and instructional leadership as well as school improvement are identified by the Commission as key areas in the assessment of administrators' practices. Program providers share instructional leadership signature assignments and a teacher observation cycle is identified as an essential component of instructional leadership. Another multi-faceted cycle of collaborative inquiry, developed by CSUEB faculty (Collay, Winkelman, Garcia, & Guilkey-Amado, 2010; Winkelman, 2013) as an "Equity Plan", asks new leaders to collect qualitative and quantitative data to facilitate a collective determination and examination of a problem of practice, an opportunity gap, that must be addressed in order to better serve students at their site(s). After some debate, the "Equity Plan" is divided into two separate cycles of inquiry. Ultimately the design team collaboratively constructs three leadership cycles. Each cycle employs "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." (Capea.org)

CAPEA members serving on the APA design team continue to promote and pursue an authentic, equity-driven assessment of leadership practice. Each cycle embeds unambiguous directives for candidates to frame their leadership actions within an understanding of the systemic inequities that plague public education. In cycle 1, *Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity*, the purpose is to identify equity gaps to inform an initial plan for equitable improvement in alliance with a school's vision, mission, and goals. The closing step of the cycle requires candidates to reflect upon equitable leadership. Cycle 2, *Facilitating Communities of Practice*, focuses on facilitating collaborative professional learning for the purpose of improving teaching and student learning or well-being. The candidate leads a group in selecting 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. Finally, throughout cycle 3, *Supporting Teacher Growth*, candidates reflect on their strengths and areas for professional growth as an instructional coach and an equity-minded leader (Appendix I). CAPEA members on the design team are instrumental in creating assessments to support the ongoing development of leaders for social justice.

Throughout the pilot and non-consequential scoring years, design team members not only facilitate CalAPA professional learning, they also gather input as they revisit and revise the descriptions and rubrics for each cycle. This process continues after the non-consequential scoring year as several design team members, along with a few additional CAPEA members, agree to serve on the standards-setting committee in the spring of 2019. The 2019-2020 academic year is the year the CalAPA becomes consequential, as candidates are required to post submissions for all three cycles and meet a Commission-adopted passing standard as a completion requirement for their PASC program.

At the August 2019 CCTC meeting the Commission discuss an action item to establish initial passing scores for all three CalAPA cycles. In public comments, CAPEA commends the collaboration across programs, CCTC staff, as well as the contractor, Pearson that has led to a robust, equity-center assessment. CAPEA draws attention to disaggregated data regarding candidate submissions. As an example, CAPEA shares the data table for cycle 2 which indicates that, at the standard setting committee's recommended cut score of 17, only 62% of Black PASC candidates would pass the cycle. CAPEA supports the CCTC staff recommendations to adopt lower, provisionally cut scores at this time. CAPEA offers to collaborate with CCTC staff on a

thorough examination of the disproportionate data. We propose that as scholar-practitioners we can contribute extensive research on bias, using frameworks such as Critical Race Theory (CRT) to not only discuss, but address the issues that emerge in the scoring of CalAPA cycles. The commission approves the provisional cut scores suggested by CCTC staff, but commissioners raise concerns about moving forward with the standards-setting committee's recommendations without addressing the discrepancies in the disaggregated data.

In June 2021 the commission is again presented with an action item addressing CCTC staff recommendations for adopting a new passing score standard for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA):

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.

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. (EPC 4C-1 June 2021)

Upon reading this action item, CAPEA members coalesce to express their concerns and request that the commission reconvene a standards-setting committee to address the issues raised in August 2019. As evidenced in the following excerpts from public comments provided by CAPEA members, we articulate the inequities that have become further exposed in the two years since the CalAPA scores were last publicly examined.

I see firsthand the impact the test has had, in particular, on minoritized educators whose communities have been disproportionately affected by the four pandemics, and with teaching and leading in hard hit underserved and majority minority schools. While 2020 was a challenging year for CalAPA, 2021 has been undoubtedly one of the hardest years for educators in general, and Black and Brown educators, in particular as you assuredly have seen in the data, including on the decline of submissions of the CalAPA. Not only has this been a difficult year in every way, but the proposal to increase cut scores that may disproportionately impact the number of principals of color is concerning. For these reasons, I object to moving forward without the opportunity for the field to be provided an analysis of the data regarding the concerns raised by The Committee in 2019.

CAPEA members further uphold the initial call for program providers to have representation, a voice, in the oversight of the CalAPA. The statement that "commission staff" will monitor score data does not align with the promise to include program providers throughout the design process and

implementation:

The representation gap of principals of color is alarming. The recent Wallace Report is clear about the benefits of principals of color in schools with students of color. We must intensify our recruitment, preparation and retention efforts of leaders of color who can be effective with marginalized students. Raising cut scores without discussion from the Standard Setting Committee and other stakeholders is concerning and not what our committee was led to believe.

It is my responsibility to prepare aspiring school leaders. Our program emphasizes social justice leadership preparation. It is concerning to hear that increasing Cal APA scores may result in fewer numbers of leaders of color in our schools. I strongly support the reconvening of the Standards Setting Committee before any decisions are made about scores for the Cal APA.

CAPEA members coordinate our comments with Dr. Rebecca Cheung, who writes on behalf of the UCLA and UCB Principal Leadership Institutes and clearly captures many of the reasons why item 4C should not move forward as an action item:

I object to moving forward without the opportunity for the field to be provided an analysis of the data regarding the concerns raised by The Committee in 2019. I am in agreement with the four issues raised by Rebecca Cheung, EdD, Executive Director Leadership Programs, Graduate School of Education Director, 21CSLA State Center. This is not the time to raise scores I support waiting another year so that data will reflect a longer span of time to analyze the impact to candidates of color. Then once again involve the Standards Committee with continuing members and adding new members to support both field involvement and transparency.

As further articulated by Dr. Noni Reis in comments made at the commission's zoom meeting, approving the higher cut scores at this time would lead to a systemic exclusion of leaders of color:

Given the commission's commitment to leadership for equity, it is imperative that we further examine the issues of inequity in the CalAPA before raising cut scores. The proposed cuts would result in 13 fewer schools led by Latinx leaders. This at a time when a recent report by the Wallace Foundation cites principal diversity as a contributing factor in improved outcomes for students. California statistics mirror the national data of approximately 22% of principals (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020) and 6% of superintendents (Kowalski, 2013) are of color. Our goal must be to increase the number of leaders of color in our schools.

In response to the public comments provided online, as well as in zoom meetings, commissioners express concern that those of us in the field have not yet had the opportunity to collectively return to the question as to why the CalAPA yielded inequitable outcomes (in terms of scores); after much discussion a motion is made to postpone the proposed action to change the cut scores and a request that the standards-setting committee be reconvened. This has been a journey and the journey continues:

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. (EPC 4C-1 June 2021)

As CAPEA continues our collective action to support the preparation and development of equity-minded leaders, we must consider not only the implications of policy, but the underlying assumptions upon which policy decisions are based. We must continue to raise questions at every juncture in our journey. We must take the time to examine, discuss, and apply research frames to better understand current circumstances and potential next steps. For instance, we know that educators of color are most likely to serve predominately low-income communities of color (Sun, 2018). This raises many potential inquiries, questions, such as: what are the conditions (i.e. high teacher turnover) in the communities candidates serve; how are these conditions addressed, taken into account, within the CalAPA assessment?; are we carefully reading candidates' reflections on historically marginalized communities and bearing in mind the challenges faced as they develop learning communities engaging in relevant (not cookie cutter) problems of practice? Furthermore, we may need to explore the degree to which the demographics of the CalAPA "calibrated assessors" align with the demographic data of California school communities. Is it possible that while assessors meet the criteria for experience in the field, they are not a representative sample of leaders who serve diverse communities? CAPEA members appointed to the next standard-setting panel may also consider the questions that provoked a re-convening, including: Who is the "we" who will continue to monitor CalAPA score data? And who will offer scholar-practitioner advice on recommendations regarding leadership preparation policy and practice? CAPEA members, as scholar-practitioners, can contribute extensive research on bias, using frameworks such as CRT to not only discuss, but also address, the issues that may emerge in the scoring of CalAPA cycles.

Continuing the Activism, Moral Courage: A Public Face

We are proud of CAPEA's continuing, collective actions as stewards of educational leadership. We also wish to acknowledge the individual CAPEA members who generously and courageously commit their time to essential committee work on the CalAPA Design Team (Appendix I) as well as the CalAPA Standards-Setting Panel (Appendix II). We recognize the CAPEA Presidents who take responsibility, with approval from their Board members (Appendix III), for addressing the commission in formal letters. Finally, we appreciate the CAPEA members who serve as the "face of CAPEA" through their willingness to provide public comments at commission meetings: John Borba, Ardella Dailey, Steve Davis, Mariama Gray, Margaret Harris, Mei-Yan Lu, Ken Magdeleno, Noni Mendoza-Reis, Vicki Montera, Bobbie Plough, Carol Van

Vooren, and Peg Winkelman. We encourage others, who identify themselves as leaders for social justice, to join us in our efforts of activism and moral courage to advocate for the educational rights of California's diverse student population.

References

- Collay, M., Winkelman, P., Garcia, R. & Guilkey-Amado, J. (2010) *Transformational leadership pedagogy: Implementing equity plans in urban schools*, Educational Leadership Review 21(1), 27-38
- Lindsey, D. B.; Martinez, R.S.; Lindsey, R. B. (2006) *Culturally proficient coaching: Supporting educators to create equitable schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA Corwin Press
- Lindsey, D. B.; Martinez, R.S.; Lindsey, R. B.; Myatt, K. (2019) *Culturally proficient coaching: supporting educators to create equitable schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA Corwin Press
- Sun, M. (2018) *Black teachers' retention and transfer patterns in North Carolina: How do patterns vary by teacher effectiveness, subject, and school conditions?* AERA Open, 4(3).
- Winkelman, P. (2013) *Collaborative inquiry for equity: Discipline and discomfort*. Planning and Changing: An Educational Leadership and Policy Journal 43(4), 280-293

Appendix I

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 II

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
Noni M. Reis	CAPEA (Note: Day 1 participant)

Appendix III

CAPEA Board Members 2013-2021

Executive Committee 2019-2021

President: Becky Sumbera, California State University, San Bernardino

President-Elect: Ardella Dailey, California State University, East Bay

Secretary: Glenn Sewell, National University

Treasurer: Gilberto Arriaza, California State University, East Bay

Board Members: Annie Blankenship, University of Redlands; Kimmie Tang, California State University, Dominguez Hills William Loose, National University; Louis Wildman, California State University, Bakersfield; Charles Flores, California State University, Los Angeles; Susan Belenardo, University of California, Riverside; Jack Bagwell, California State University, Northridge; Wesley Henry, California State University, Monterey Bay; Cliff Tyler, National University; Mari Gray, California State University, East Bay; Brooke Soles, California State University, San Marcos; Sonia Rodriguez, National University; Jennifer Moradian Watson, Fresno State University; Wayne Padover, National University; Ursula Estrada-Reveles, Riverside County Office of Education Susan Jindra, California State University, San Bernardino

Executive Council 2018-2019

President: Dr. Noni M. Reis California State University, San José State University

President-Elect: Dr. Becky Sumbera California State University, San Bernardino

Secretary/Treasurer: Dr. Ursula Reveles Estrada Riverside County Office of Education

Membership Officer: Dr. Wayne Padover National University

Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Liaison: Dr. Peg Winkelman California State University, East Bay

California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) Liaison: Dr. Mariama Gray
|California State University, East Bay

Social Justice Liaisons: Dr. Ardella Dailey California State University, East Bay, Dr. Mei Yan Lu California State University, San José

Membership & Promotion Officer: Dr. Sonia Rodriguez National University Communications

Officer & Webmaster: Dr. Brooke Soles California State University, San Marcos

Research Grants Liaison: Dr. Teri Marcos National University

Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and CAPEA Liaisons: Dr. Teri Marcos National University, Dr. Cliff Tyler National University

Board Members at Large: Dr. Mariama Gray California State University, East Bay, Dr. Susan Belenardo University of California, Irvine, Dr. Bill Loose Azusa Pacific University, Dr. Cliff Taylor National University, Dr. Glenn Sewell National University, Dr. Sonia Rodriguez National University

Historian: Dr. Louis Wildman California State University, Bakersfield

ICPEL Liaison: RD Nordgren National University

Executive Council 2017-2018

President: R.D. Nordgren, National University

President Elect: Noni Mendoza Reis, San Jose State University

Secretary/Treasurer: Becky Sumbera, California State University, San Bernardino

Journal Managing Editors Volume 29: Gilberto Arriaza, California State University, East Bay; Noni Mendoza Reis, San Jose State University

Board Members: Susan Belenardo, University of California, Irvine; Ron Oliver, California State University, Fresno; Sonia Rodriguez, National University; Cliff Tyler, National University; Brooke Soles, California State University, San Marcos; Glenn Sewell, National University

Historian: Louis Wildman, California State University, Bakersfield

Membership Committee: Wayne Padover, National University

Liaison to CTC: Peg Winkelman, California State University, East Bay

Liaison to ICPEA: Gary Kinsey, California State University, Channel Islands

Liaison to ACSA/CAPEA: Teri Marcos, National University

Liaison to ACSA Superintendents: Cliff Tyler, National University

Executive Council 2016-17

Co-Presidents: Carol VanVooren, CSU San Marcos and Bobbie Plough, CSU East Bay

President Elect: R.D. Nordgren, National University

Secretary/Treasurer: Noni Mendoza Reis, San José State University

Journal Managing Editor Volume 28: Albert Jones, CSU Los Angeles

Board Members: Don Wise, Fresno State University, Susan Belenardo, UC Riverside, Becky Sumbera, CSU San Bernardino; Angela Loque, CSU San Bernardino, Susan Jindra, CSU San Bernardino, Jennifer Watson.

Historian: Louis Wildman, CSU Bakersfield and Randall Lindsey, CSU Los Angeles

Membership Committee: Wayne Padover, National University

Liaison to CTC: Peg Winkelman, CSU East Bay

Liaison to NCPEA: Gary Kinsey, CSU Channel Islands

Liaison to ACSA/CAPEA: Teri Marcos, National University Liaison to ACSA Superintendents
Cliff Tyler, National University

Executive Council 2015-2016

President: Lori Kim, *California State University Los Angeles*

Co-Presidents-Elect: Carol VanVooren *California State University, San Marcos*; Bobbie Plough,
California State University, East Bay

Secretary / Treasurer: R.D. Nordgren, *National University*

Journal Managing Editor: Gilberto Arriaza

Board Members: Susan Belenardo, Ardella Dailey, Cary Dritz, Susan Jindra, Louis Wildman

Historian: Randall Lindsey

Membership Committee: Wayne Padover

Liaison to CTC: Peg Winkelman

Liaison to NCPEA: Gary Kinsey

Liaison to ACSA/CAPEA: Teri Marcos

Liaison to ACSA Superintendents: Cliff Tyler

Journal Managing Editors: Gilberto Arriaza, *California State University, East Bay*; Noni
Mendoza Reis, *San Jose State University*

Executive Council 2014-2015

Co- Presidents: Dr. Delores Lindsey *California State University, San Marcos*; Dr. Linda
Purrington *Pepperdine University*

Presidents-Elect: Dr. Carol VanVooren *California State University, San Marcos*, Dr. Lori Kim
California State University, Los Angeles

Secretary / Treasurer: Dr. Bobbie Plough *California State University, East Bay*

CAPEA Diversity & Equity Committee Chairs: Dr. Ken Magdaleno California State University, Fresno Dr. Ardella Dailey California State University, East Bay

ACSA/CAPEA Committee Chair: Dr. Rich Malfatti, Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)

California School Board Association/CSBA Liaison: Dr. Bobbie Plough California State University, East Bay NCPEA Liaison; Dr. Gary Kinsey California State University, Channel Islands UCEA Liaison

Journal Managing Editors: Dr. Gilberto Arriaza, California State University, East Bay; Dr. Noni Mendoza Reis, San Jose State University

Legislative Liaison: Dr. Peg Winkelman California State University, East Bay

Membership Committee Chair: Dr. Wayne Padover National University

Historian: Dr. Randall Lindsey California State University, Los Angeles Professor Emeritus

Members at Large: Dr. Cary Dritz Cal Lutheran University; Dr. Jody Dunlap California State University, Northridge; Dr. Bendta Friesen California State University, Fresno; Dr. R.D. Nordgren National University; Dr. Anthony Rosilez California State University, San Marcos

Executive Council 2013-2014

President: Peg Winkelman *California State University, East Bay*

Presidents-Elect: Delores Lindsey *California State University, San Marcos*

Linda Purrington *Pepperdine University*

Secretary / Treasurer: Carol VanVooren *California State University, San Marcos*

CAPEA Diversity & Equity Committee Chair: Kenneth R Magdaleno *California State University, Fresno*

ACSA/CAPEA Committee Chair: Tony Avina *California State Polytechnic University, Pomona*

ACSA Superintendents' Committee Liaison: James Scott *California State University, Long Beach*

CSBA Liaison: Ron Leon *California State Polytechnic University, Pomona*

UCEA Liaison: Linda Hauser *California State University, Fresno*

Legislative Liaison: Bob Kladifko *California State University, Northridge*

NCPEA Liaisons: Deb Erickson *California Lutheran University*; Wayne Padover *National University*; Gary W. Kinsey *California State University Channel Islands*

Journal Managing Editors: Dr. Albert Jones, California State University, Los Angeles, Dr. Gilberto Arriaza, California State University, East Bay; Dr. Noni Mendoza Reis, San Jose State University

Members at Large: Susan Jindra *California State University, San Bernardino*; Ron Oliver *California State University, Fullerton*; Don Wise *California State University, Fresno*; Thelma Moore-Steward *California State University, San Bernardino* Randall Lindsey *California State University, Los Angeles Professor Emeritus* Mei-Yan Lu *San Jose State University*; Chris N. Thomas, *University of San Francisco*

Appendix IV

Description of CalAPA Leadership Cycles

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.