



Listening. Learning. Leading.

Multistate Standard-setting Technical Report

PRAXIS™ SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT ASSESSMENT (6021)

Licensure and Credentialing Research

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

June 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To support the decision-making process for education agencies with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis™ School Superintendent Assessment (6021), research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a multistate standard-setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level superintendents.

PARTICIPATING STATES

Panelists from nine states were recommended by their respective education agency to participate. The education agencies recommended panelists with (a) experience, either as superintendents or assistant superintendents, or college faculty who prepare superintendents and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning superintendents.

RECOMMENDED PASSING SCORE

The recommended passing score is provided to help education agencies determine an appropriate operational passing score. For the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment, the recommended passing score is 93 (out of a possible 145 raw-score points). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 93 is 160 (on a 100 - 200 scale).

SUMMARY OF CONTENT SPECIFICATION JUDGMENTS

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level superintendents. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content covered by the test is important for beginning practice.

To support the decision-making process for education agencies with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis™ School Superintendent Assessment (6021), research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a multistate standard-setting study in May 2012 in Princeton, New Jersey. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level superintendents. Panelists were recommended by education agencies¹ to participate. The education agencies recommended panelists with (a) experience, either as superintendents or assistant superintendents, or college faculty who prepare superintendents and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning superintendents. Nine states (see Table 1) were represented by 18 panelists. (See Appendix A for the names and affiliations of the panelists.)

Table 1
Participating States and Number of Panelists

Arkansas (2 panelists)	New Jersey (3 panelists)
Idaho (2 panelists)	Nevada (1 panelist)
Kansas (3 panelists)	Pennsylvania (1 panelist)
Louisiana (2 panelists)	Rhode Island (2 panelists)
Missouri (2 panelists)	

The following technical report is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the test. The second section describes the standard-setting processes and methods. The third section presents the results of the standard-setting study.

The passing-score recommendation for the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment is provided to each of the represented education agencies. In each state, the department of education, the board of education, or a designated educator licensure board is responsible for establishing the final passing score in accordance with applicable regulations. The study provides a recommended passing score, which represent the combined judgments of a group of experienced educators. The full range of an education agency’s needs and expectations cannot likely be represented during the standard-setting study. Each state, therefore, may want to consider the recommended passing score and other sources of information when setting the final Praxis School Superintendent Assessment passing score (see Geisinger &

¹ States that currently use one or more Praxis tests were invited to participate in the multistate standard-setting study.

McCormick, 2010). A state may accept the recommended passing score, adjust the score upward to reflect more stringent expectations, or adjust the score downward to reflect more lenient expectations. There is no *correct* decision; the appropriateness of any adjustment may only be evaluated in terms of its meeting the state's needs.

Two sources of information to consider when setting the passing score are the standard error of measurement (SEM) and the standard error of judgment (SEJ). The former addresses the reliability of the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment score and the latter, the reliability of panelists' passing-score recommendation. The SEM allows a state to recognize that a Praxis School Superintendent Assessment score—any test score on any test—is less than perfectly reliable. A test score only approximates what a candidate *truly* knows or *truly* can do on the test. The SEM, therefore, addresses the question: How close of an approximation is the test score to the *true* score? The SEJ allows a state to consider the likelihood that the recommended passing score from the current panel would be similar to the passing scores recommended by other panels of experts similar in composition and experience. The smaller the SEJ the more likely that another panel would recommend a passing score consistent with the recommended passing score. The larger the SEJ, the less likely the recommended passing score would be reproduced by another panel.

In addition to measurement error metrics (e.g., SEM, SEJ), each state should consider the likelihood of classification error. That is, when adjusting a passing score, policymakers should consider whether it is more important to minimize a false positive decision or to minimize a false negative decision. A false positive decision occurs when a candidate's test score suggests he should receive a license/certificate, but his actual level of knowledge/skills indicates otherwise (i.e., the candidate does not possess the required knowledge/skills). A false negative occurs when a candidate's test score suggests that she should not receive a license/certificate, but she actually does possess the required knowledge/skills. The state needs to consider which decision error may be more important to minimize.

OVERVIEW OF THE PRAXIS SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT ASSESSMENT

The Praxis School Superintendent Assessment *Test at a Glance* document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the test. In brief, the test measures whether entry-level superintendents have the knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the test, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The three-hour assessment is divided into two parts. Part A contains 120 multiple-choice questions² covering three content areas: *Educational Leadership* (approximately 48 questions); *Instructional Leadership* (approximately 24 questions); and *Administrative Leadership* (approximately 48 questions)³. Part B contains three constructed-response questions covering *Integrated Knowledge and Understanding*. The reporting scale for the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment test ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

The first national administration of the new Praxis School Superintendent Assessment will occur in December 2012.

² Eleven of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions and do not contribute to a candidate's score.

³ The number of questions for each content area may vary slightly from form to form of the test.

PROCESSES AND METHODS

The following section describes the standard-setting processes and methods. (The agenda for the panel meetings is presented in Appendix B.)

The design of the standard-setting study included an expert panel. The panelists were sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the standard-setting study and requesting that they review the content specifications for the test (included in the *Test at a Glance* document, which was attached to the e-mail). The purpose of the review was to familiarize the panelists with the general structure and content of the test.

The standard-setting study began with a welcome and introduction by the meeting facilitator. The facilitator explained how the test was developed, provided an overview of standard setting, and presented the agenda for the study.

REVIEWING THE TEST

The first activity was for the panelists to “take the test.” (Each panelist had signed a nondisclosure form.) The panelists were given approximately two and a half hours to respond to the multiple-choice questions and to sketch responses to the constructed-response questions. (Panelists were instructed not to refer to the answer key for the multiple-choice questions while taking the test.) The purpose of “taking the test” was for the panelists to become familiar with the test format, content, and difficulty. After “taking the test,” the panelists checked their responses against the answer key for the multiple-choice questions and the scoring rubrics for the constructed-response questions.

The panelists then engaged in a discussion of the major content areas being addressed by the test; they were also asked to remark on any content areas that they thought would be particularly challenging for entering superintendents, and areas that addressed content that would be particularly important for entering superintendents.

DEFINING THE JUST QUALIFIED CANDIDATE

Following the review of the test, panelists internalized the definition of the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). The JQC is the test taker who has the minimum level of knowledge and skills believed necessary to be a qualified superintendent. The JQC definition is the operational definition of the

passing score. The goal of the standard-setting process is to identify the test score that aligns with this definition of the JQC.

The panel developed the JQC definition. The panelists were split into smaller groups, and each group was asked to write down its definition of a JQC. Each group referred to the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment *Test at a Glance* to guide their definition. Each group posted its definition on chart paper, and a full-panel discussion occurred to reach a consensus on a definition (see Appendix C for the definition).

PANELISTS' JUDGMENTS

The standard-setting process for the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment was conducted for the overall test, though one standard-setting approach was implemented for Part A (multiple-choice questions) and another approach was implemented for Part B (constructed-response questions). The panel's passing score for the test is the sum of the interim passing scores recommended by the panelists for each part. As with scoring and reporting, the panelists' judgments for Part B, the constructed-response questions, were weighted such that Part B contributed 25% of the overall score.

Standard Setting for Part A (multiple-choice questions). A probability-based Angoff method (Brandon, 2004; Hambleton & Pitoniak, 2006) was used for Part A (multiple-choice questions). In this approach, for each question, a panelist decides on the likelihood (probability or chance) that a JQC would answer it correctly. Panelists made their judgments using the following rating scale: 0, .05, .10, .20, .30, .40, .50, .60, .70, .80, .90, .95, 1. The lower the value, the less likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly, because the question is difficult for the JQC. The higher the value, the more likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly.

The panelists were asked to approach the judgment process in two stages. First, they reviewed the definition of the JQC and the question and decided if, overall, the question was difficult for the JQC, easy for the JQC, or moderately difficult/easy. The facilitator encouraged the panelists to consider the following rule of thumb to guide their decision:

- difficult questions for a JQC were in the 0 to .30 range;
- moderately difficult/easy questions for a JQC were in the .40 to .60 range; and
- easy questions for a JQC were in the .70 to 1 range.

The second decision was for panelists to decide how they wanted to refine their judgment within the range. For example, if a panelist thought that a question was easy for a JQC, the initial decision located the question in the .70 to 1 range. The second decision was for the panelist to decide if the likelihood of answering it correctly was .70, .80, .90, .95, or 1.0. The two-stage decision-process was implemented to reduce the cognitive load placed on the panelists. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments on several questions on the test.

The panelists engaged in two rounds of judgments. Following Round 1, question-level feedback was provided to the panel. The panelists' judgments were displayed for each question. The panelists' judgments were summarized by the three general difficulty levels (0 to .30, .40 to .60, and .70 to 1), and the panel's average question judgment was provided. Questions were highlighted to show when panelists converged in their judgments (at least two-thirds of the panelists located a question in the same difficulty range) or diverged in their judgments. Panelists were asked to share their rationales for the judgments they made. Following this discussion, panelists were provided an opportunity to change their question-level standard-setting judgments (Round 2).

Standard Setting for Part B (constructed-response questions). An Extended Angoff method (Cizek & Bunch, 2007; Hambleton & Plake, 1995) was used for Part B (constructed-response questions). In this approach, for each question, a panelist decides on the assigned score value that would most likely be earned by a JQC. The basic process that each panelist followed was first to review the definition of the JQC and then to review the question and the rubric for that question. The rubric for a question defines holistically the quality of the evidence that would merit a response earning a score of 3, 2, 1 or 0. During this review, each panelist independently considered the level of knowledge and skills required to respond to the question and the features of a response that would earn 3, 2, 1, or 0 points, as defined by the rubric.

A test-taker's response to a constructed-response question is independently scored by two raters, and the sum of the raters' scores is the assigned score⁴; possible scores, therefore, range from zero (both raters assigned a score of zero) to six (both raters assigned a score of three). Each panelist decided on the score most likely to be earned by a JQC from the following possible values: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. For each of the constructed-response questions, panelists recorded the score (0 through 6) that a JQC would most

⁴ If the two raters' scores differ by more than one point (non-adjacent), the Chief Reader for that question assigns the score, which is then doubled.

likely earn. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments on the first constructed-response question in Part B.

Consistent with the standard-setting process used for Part A, the panelists engaged in two rounds of judgments for Part B. Following Round 1, question-level feedback was provided to the panel. The panelists' judgments were displayed for each question. The panelists participated in a general discussion of the results. Panelists were asked to share their rationales for the judgments they made. Following this discussion, panelists were provided an opportunity to change their question-level standard-setting judgments (Round 2).

JUDGMENT OF CONTENT SPECIFICATIONS

In addition to the two-round standard-setting process, the panel judged the importance of the knowledge and skills stated or implied in the content specifications for the job of an entry-level superintendent. These judgments addressed the perceived content-based validity of the test. Judgments were made using a four-point scale — *Very Important*, *Important*, *Slightly Important*, and *Not Important*. Each panelist independently judged the content categories and supporting statements.

RESULTS

EXPERT PANEL

A summary of the panelists' demographic information are presented in Table 2. The panel included 18 educators representing nine states. (See Appendix A for a listing of panelists.) In brief, nine panelists were superintendents, two were assistant superintendents, one was an educational director and six were college faculty. (One panelist was both college faculty and an interim superintendent.) All of the panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of superintendents. Sixteen panelists were White and two were Black or African American. Eleven panelists were male. Two-thirds of the panelists (12 of the 18 panelists) had 11 or fewer years of experience as a superintendent.

Table 2
Panel Member Demographics

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Current Position		
Superintendent	9	50%
Assistant (Associate or Deputy) Superintendent	2	11%
College Faculty ⁵	6	33%
Educational Director	1	6%
Race		
White	16	89%
Black or African American	2	11%
Gender		
Female	7	39%
Male	11	61%
Are you currently certified as a superintendent in your state?		
Yes	15	83%
No	3	17%
Are you currently a superintendent in your state?		
Yes	11	61%
No	7	39%

⁵ One of the panelists was both a college faculty member and an interim superintendent.

Table 2 (continued)
Panel Member Demographics

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Are you currently supervising or mentoring other superintendents or assistant superintendents?		
Yes	11	61%
No	7	39%
At what K-12 grade level are you working as a superintendent?		
Elementary and Middle School	1	6%
High School (9-12 or 10-13)	1	6%
All Grades	10	56%
Not currently teaching at the K-12 level	6	33%
Including this year, how many years of experience do you have as a superintendent?		
3 years or less	6	33%
4 - 7 years	3	17%
8 - 11 years	3	17%
12 - 15 years	3	17%
16 years or more	3	17%
Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?		
Urban	0	0%
Suburban	7	39%
Rural	6	33%
Not currently working at the K-12 level ⁶	5	28%
If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of school leaders?		
Yes	6	33%
No	0	0%
Not college faculty	12	67%

INITIAL EVALUATION

The panelists completed an initial evaluation after receiving training on how to make standard-setting judgments. The primary information collected was the panelists indicating if they had received adequate training to make their standard-setting judgments and were ready to proceed. All panelists indicated that they were prepared to make their judgments.

⁶ One of the panelists was both a college faculty member and an interim superintendent.

SUMMARY OF STANDARD-SETTING JUDGMENTS

A summary of standard-setting judgments for Part A (multiple-choice), Part B (constructed-response), and the overall test are presented in Table 3. The numbers in the table summarize the recommended passing scores—the number of raw points needed to “pass” the parts of the test as well as the overall test. For Part B, weighted passing scores are presented; for the overall test, the weighted passing scores (i.e., sum of Part A and the weighted Part B passing scores) are presented. Note that the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment reports a single, overall score and that the panel is recommending a single passing score for the combination of Parts A and B. The separate “passing scores” for the two parts are intermediate steps in calculating the overall passing score. The panel’s average recommended passing scores and highest and lowest passing scores are reported, as are the standard deviations (SD) of panelists’ passing scores and the standard errors of judgment (SEJ).

The SEJ is one way of estimating the reliability or consistency of a panel’s standard-setting judgments⁷. It indicates how likely it would be for several other panels of educators similar in makeup, experience, and standard-setting training to the current panel to recommend the same passing score on the same form of the test.

Round 1 judgments are made without discussion among the panelists. The most variability in judgments, therefore, is typically present in the first round. Round 2 judgments, however, are informed by panel discussion; thus, it is common to see a decrease both in the standard deviation and SEJ. This decrease — indicating convergence among the panelists’ judgments — was observed (see Table 3). The Round 2 average score is the panel’s recommended passing score.

The panel’s passing score recommendation for the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment is 92.24 (out of a possible 145 raw-score points). The value was rounded to the next highest whole number, 93, to determine the functional recommended passing. The scaled score associated with 93 raw points is 160.

⁷ An SEJ assumes that panelists are randomly selected and that standard-setting judgments are independent. It is seldom the case that panelists are randomly sampled, and only the first round of judgments may be considered independent. The SEJ, therefore, likely underestimates the uncertainty of passing scores (Tannenbaum & Katz, in press).

Table 3
Passing Score Summary by Round of Judgments

Panelist	Round 1			Round 2		
	Part A	Part B (weighted)	Total	Part A	Part B (weighted)	Total
1	70.65	22.00	92.65	70.45	22.00	92.45
2	68.10	22.00	90.10	67.10	22.00	89.10
3	62.40	20.00	82.40	58.70	22.00	80.70
4	75.35	16.00	91.35	73.80	18.00	91.80
5	75.70	18.00	93.70	75.70	18.00	93.70
6	69.45	24.00	93.45	69.25	22.00	91.25
7	71.90	20.00	91.90	70.50	18.00	88.50
8	68.90	26.00	94.90	69.60	26.00	95.60
9	63.45	24.00	87.45	61.65	24.00	85.65
10	72.80	22.00	94.80	72.00	22.00	94.00
11	68.65	28.00	96.65	69.85	28.00	97.85
12	82.60	24.00	106.60	81.40	24.00	105.40
13	68.70	20.00	88.70	68.50	20.00	88.50
14	50.15	22.00	72.15	54.70	22.00	76.70
15	72.55	22.00	94.55	71.15	22.00	93.15
16	73.00	26.00	99.00	72.50	26.00	98.50
17	91.45	26.00	117.45	87.40	26.00	113.40
18	57.50	24.00	81.50	60.10	24.00	84.10
Average	70.18	22.56	92.74	69.69	22.56	92.24
Lowest	50.15	16.00	72.15	54.70	18.00	76.70
Highest	91.45	28.00	117.45	87.40	28.00	113.40
SD	8.97	3.05	9.65	7.79	2.89	8.51
SEJ	2.11	0.72	2.27	1.84	0.68	2.01

Table 4 presents the estimated conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) around the recommended passing score. A standard error represents the uncertainty associated with a test score. The scaled score associated with one and two CSEMs above and below the recommended passing score are provided. The conditional standard error of measurement provided is an estimate, given that the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment has not yet been administered operationally.

Table 4

Passing Scores Within 1 and 2 CSEMs of the Recommended Passing Score⁸

Recommended passing score (CSEM)		Scale score equivalent
	93 (5.70)	160
- 2 CSEMs	82	150
-1 CSEM	88	155
+1 CSEM	99	165
+ 2 CSEMs	105	170

SUMMARY OF CONTENT-SPECIFICATION JUDGMENTS

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and skills reflected by the content specifications was important for entry-level superintendents. Panelists rated the knowledge and skills statements on a four-point scale ranging from *Very Important* to *Not Important*. The panelists' ratings are summarized in Appendix D (see Table D1). All of the 53 knowledge and skills statements were judged to be *Very Important* or *Important* by at least two-thirds, or 12, of the 18 panelists.

⁸ The unrounded CSEM value is added to or subtracted from the rounded passing-score recommendation. The resulting values are rounded up to the next highest whole number and the rounded values are converted to scaled scores.

SUMMARY OF FINAL EVALUATIONS

The panelists completed a final evaluation at the conclusion of their standard-setting study. The final evaluation asked the panelists to provide feedback about the quality of the standard-setting implementation and the factors that influenced their decisions. A summary of the final evaluation results are presented in Appendix D (see Table D2).

All panelists *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that they understood the purpose of the study, and that the facilitator's instructions and explanations were clear. All panelists *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that they were prepared to make their standard-setting judgments. All panelists *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that the standard-setting process was easy to follow.

All panelists reported that the definition of the JQC was at least *somewhat influential* in guiding their standard-setting judgments; 14 of the 18 panelists indicated the definition was *very influential*. All of the panelists reported that between-round discussions were at least *somewhat influential* in guiding their judgments. Two-thirds of the panelists (12 of the 18 panelists) indicated that their own professional experience was *very influential* in guiding their judgments.

All of the panelists indicated they were at least *somewhat comfortable* with the passing score they recommended; 11 of the 18 panelists were *very comfortable*. Seventeen of the 18 panelists indicated the recommended passing score was *about right* with the remaining panelist believing the passing score was *too high*.

SUMMARY

To support the decision-making process for education agencies with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service designed and conducted a multistate standard-setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level superintendents.

The recommended passing score is provided to help education agencies determine an appropriate operational passing score. For the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment, the recommended passing score is 93 (out of a possible 145 raw-score points). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 93 is 160 (on a 100 - 200 scale).

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and skills reflected by the content specifications was important for entry-level superintendents. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content covered by the test is important for beginning practice.

REFERENCES

- Brandon, P.R. (2004). Conclusions about frequently studied modified Angoff standard-setting topics. *Applied Measurement in Education, 17*, 59-88.
- Cizek, G. J., & Bunch, M.B. (2007). *Standard setting: A guide to establishing and evaluating performance standards on tests*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- ETS. (in press). *The Praxis Series: School Superintendent Assessment (6021)*. Princeton, NJ: Author.
- Geisinger, K. F. & McCormick, C. M. (2010), Adopting Cut Scores: Post-Standard-Setting Panel Considerations for Decision Makers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 29*, 38–44.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Pitoniak, M.J. (2006). Setting performance standards. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (4th ed., pp. 433-470). Westport, CT: American Council on Education/Praeger.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Plake, B.S. (1995). Using an extended Angoff procedure to set standards on complex performance assessments. *Applied Measurement in Education, 8*, 41-55.
- Tannenbaum, R.J., & Katz, I.R. (in press). Standard setting. In K.F. Geisinger (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Testing and Assessment in Psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

APPENDIX A

PANELISTS' NAMES & AFFILIATIONS

Praxis School Superintendent Assessment

<u>Panelist</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Cade Brumley	DeSoto Parish Schools (LA)
Jared Cleveland	Lavaca School District (AR)
Paula Bell Davis	LADOE- Special School District (LA)
Mary Devin	Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KS)
Bernard DiLullo Jr.	Johnston Public Schools (RI)
Charles R. Ford Jr.	Monmouth regional High School (NJ)
Becky Ford	Post Falls School District (ID)
Elaine F. Giugliano	Felician College (NJ)
Gary K. Larsen	Nampa School District (ID)
Carol Maher	University of Missouri (MO)
Victor D. Mercurio	East Greenwich Public Schools (RI)
Rene Rovtar	Long Hill Township School District (NJ)
Robert Slaby	Storey County School District (NV)
Shelton Smith	Missouri Baptist University (MO)
David C. Thompson	Kansas State University (KS)
Andrew Tolbert	Warren School District (AR)
Charlene A. Trovato	University of Pittsburgh (PA)
Randy Watson	McPherson Unified School District 418 (KS)

APPENDIX B
STUDY AGENDA

AGENDA

Praxis School Superintendent Assessment (6021) Standard-setting Study

Day 1

Welcome and Introduction

Overview of Standard Setting & the Praxis School
Superintendent Assessment Test

“Take” the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment Test

Discuss the Praxis School Superintendent Assessment Test

Lunch

Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC

Break

Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC (continued)

Standard Setting Training for M-C Items

Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments for Multiple-Choice

Collect Materials; End of Day 1

AGENDA

Praxis School Superintendent Assessment (6021) Standard-setting Study

Day 2

Overview of Day 2

Standard Setting Training for Constructed-Response Items

Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments for Constructed-Response

Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments

Break

Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments (continued)

Lunch

Specification Judgments

Feedback on Round 2 Recommended Passing Score

Complete Final Evaluation

Collect Materials; End of Study

APPENDIX C

JUST QUALIFIED CANDIDATE (JQC) DEFINITION

Description of a Just Qualified Candidate

A JQC ...

1. Understands the importance of using collaborative processes to develop, support, monitor, communicate and evaluate district vision and goals.
2. Is aware of the impact of culture, climate, and emerging trends in education on student and staff performance.
3. Knows the basic principles of professional behavior, laws, policies and ethics related to district leadership.
4. Understands the role of the local Board of Education and has skills to communicate, collaborate and manage school Board/superintendent relations.
5. Uses data to monitor, evaluate, and improve learning outcomes for all children.
6. Knows how to facilitate and promote a culture of high-quality teaching and learning for diverse populations.
7. Knows how to build capacity for student learning and facilitate research-based professional development.
8. Understands human resources, broad legal principles and facility management to improve the performance of the district.
9. Is familiar with the procedures for effective financial planning, budget development and fiscal responsibility.
10. Is familiar with aspects of operational management and compliance, including school safety and crisis management.

RESULTS FOR PRAXIS SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT ASSESSMENT

Table D1
Specification Judgments — School Superintendent Assessment

	Very Important		Important		Slightly Important		Not Important	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP								
A. VISION AND GOALS	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows strategies for engaging all stakeholders in the development of the district’s vision and goals	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to formulate goals and objectives using data and resources	11	61%	7	39%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to develop and implement a plan to achieve district goals and objectives	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to monitor and evaluate progress toward district goals and objectives in order to sustain continuous improvement	8	44%	9	50%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with various resources used to support the implementation of a district’s vision and goals	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%
• Knows how to assess the effect of the culture and climate of the organization on student learning	11	61%	6	33%	1	6%	0	0%
• Understands the need to recognize and celebrate the contributions of all stakeholders toward the achievement of the district’s goals and objectives	7	39%	7	39%	4	22%	0	0%

Table D1
Specification Judgments — School Superintendent Assessment

	Very Important		Important		Slightly Important		Not Important	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
B. ETHICS AND INTEGRITY	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows the basic principles of ethical professional behavior for educators	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to implement policies and procedures that promote the ethical behavior of all district personnel	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%
• Knows how to detect, monitor, and respond to ethical issues	10	56%	6	33%	2	11%	0	0%
• Knows laws, policies, and procedures that protect the rights and confidentiality of students and staff	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%
C. COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how and when to articulate positions on educational issues	11	61%	7	39%	0	0%	0	0%
• Is familiar with emerging issues and trends affecting education	9	50%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to communicate and collaborate with diverse stakeholder groups, both internal and external, in order to support the achievement of district goals	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how and when to facilitate collaborative decision making	8	44%	9	50%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with how to identify, access, and collaborate with key local, state, and national entities in order to address educational issues	8	44%	8	44%	2	11%	0	0%
• Knows how to build partnerships that strengthen programs and support district goals	9	50%	5	28%	4	22%	0	0%

Table D1
Specification Judgments — School Superintendent Assessment

	Very Important		Important		Slightly Important		Not Important	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
• Understands the roles, functions, and expectations of the superintendent and the board of education and the expectations each has of the other	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to communicate and collaborate with board members in a variety of contexts	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%
• Understands how to develop a public relations program to foster community and media relations	6	33%	7	39%	5	28%	0	0%
II. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP								
A. TEACHING AND LEARNING	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to facilitate and promote a culture of learning	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows how to evaluate and select programs, services, and resources to support the learning of all students	6	33%	11	61%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with multiple factors that affect teaching and learning	8	44%	9	50%	1	6%	0	0%
• Understands how the environment affects student learning	9	50%	8	44%	1	6%	0	0%
• Understands how organizational factors affect teaching and learning	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%
• Understands the importance of developing and implementing a district plan of student assessment	9	50%	6	33%	3	17%	0	0%
• Understands how to gather and analyze student assessment data to monitor, evaluate, and improve student learning	8	44%	9	50%	1	6%	0	0%

Table D1
Specification Judgments — School Superintendent Assessment

	Very Important		Important		Slightly Important		Not Important	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
• Is familiar with the correlation between teacher effectiveness and student learning	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%
• Is familiar with best practices and research that support personal and professional growth of all staff	9	50%	7	39%	2	11%	0	0%
• Knows the importance of implementing a comprehensive and differentiated professional development program for all staff	9	50%	7	39%	2	11%	0	0%
• Knows the importance of providing ongoing support to facilitate professional growth	7	39%	10	56%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with strategies for addressing the needs of diverse populations	9	50%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%
B. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION	6	33%	12	67%	0	0%	0	0%
• Is familiar with the basic concepts of curriculum development and design	5	28%	12	67%	1	6%	0	0%
• Knows how curriculum design and delivery systems affect instructional quality and student learning	4	22%	12	67%	2	11%	0	0%
• Understands the role of technology in teaching and learning	2	11%	12	67%	4	22%	0	0%
• Understands the importance of monitoring and evaluating curriculum and instructional practices	10	56%	8	44%	0	0%	0	0%

Table D1
Specification Judgments — School Superintendent Assessment

	Very Important		Important		Slightly Important		Not Important	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
III. ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP							0	0%
A. PERSONNEL	12	67%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%
• Knows major federal laws, regulations, and codes that cover human resource management	9	50%	7	39%	2	11%	0	0%
• Knows the basic procedures for staffing	8	44%	7	39%	3	17%	0	0%
• Knows how to assess and evaluate staff	12	67%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%
• Knows basic procedures for staff discipline, remediation, and dismissal	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%
B. FINANCE	10	56%	8	44%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows basic procedures for financial record keeping, reporting, and accountability	10	56%	6	33%	2	11%	0	0%
• Understands procedures for budget planning and management	9	50%	8	44%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with strategies for obtaining and managing resources needed to achieve the district’s mission and goals	7	39%	9	50%	2	11%	0	0%
• Is familiar with strategies for financial planning to address future district needs	5	28%	13	72%	0	0%	0	0%

Table D1
Specification Judgments — School Superintendent Assessment

	Very Important		Important		Slightly Important		Not Important	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
C. MANAGEMENT	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with how elements of facilities management affect the learning process	2	11%	13	72%	3	17%	0	0%
• Is familiar with federal laws and regulations associated with facilities management and compliance	5	28%	10	56%	2	11%	1	6%
• Knows how to implement a crisis management plan	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%
• Knows how to evaluate the efficacy of a crisis management plan	9	50%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%
• Knows strategies for time management	8	44%	9	50%	1	6%	0	0%
• Is familiar with the effect of the organizational structure of a district on day-to-day operations	9	50%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%
• Understands the role of support services in the school system	6	33%	9	50%	3	17%	0	0%
• Understands the interdependent nature of the organizational system	8	44%	7	39%	3	17%	0	0%
• Knows strategies for problem solving	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%

Table D2
Final Evaluation

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
• I understood the purpose of this study.	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%
• The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%
• The training in the standard-setting method was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment.	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
• The explanation of how the recommended passing score is computed was clear.	13	72%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%
• The opportunity for feedback and discussion between rounds was helpful.	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%
• The process of making the standard-setting judgments was easy to follow.	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%

Table D2 (continued)

Final Evaluation

How influential was each of the following factors in guiding your standard-setting judgments?	Very Influential		Somewhat Influential		Not Influential			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%		
• The definition of the JQC	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%		
• The between-round discussions	9	50%	9	50%	0	0%		
• The knowledge/skills required to answer each test question	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%		
• The passing scores of other panel members	1	6%	15	83%	2	11%		
• My own professional experience	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%		
	Very Comfortable		Somewhat Comfortable		Somewhat Uncomfortable		Very Uncomfortable	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
• Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended passing scores?	11	61%	7	39%	0	0%	0	0%
	Too Low		About Right		Too High			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%		
• Overall, the recommended passing score is:	0	0%	17	94%	1	6%		