

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Statutory Authority: 14 Delaware Code, Section 122(d) (14 Del.C. §122(d))
14 DE Admin. Code 108

PROPOSED

Education Impact Analysis Pursuant to 14 Del.C. Section 122(d)

108 Administrator Appraisal Process Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II)

A. Type of Regulatory Action Required

Amendment to Existing Regulation

B. Synopsis of Subject Matter of the Regulation

The Secretary of Education seeks the consent of the State Board of Education to amend 14 DE Admin. Code 108 Administrator Appraisal Process Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II) to reflect the status of DPAS II from a pilot to implementation and to reflect comments and suggestions from the evaluations conducted at the conclusion of the first (June 2006) and second year (June 2007) of the pilot. The evaluations were conducted by Progress Education Corporation. The rewritten regulation will reflect changes to the procedures, the forms and the student improvement section of the regulation.

Persons wishing to present their views regarding this matter may do so in writing by the close of business on or before September 5, 2007 to Susan Keene Haberstroh, Education Associate, Regulation Review and Legislative Liaison, Department of Education, at 401 Federal Street, Suite 2, Dover, DE 19901. A copy of this regulation is available from the above address or may be viewed at the Department of Education business office.

C. Impact Criteria

1. Will the amended regulation help improve student achievement as measured against state achievement standards? This regulation addresses the appraisal system for administrators, and does not address student achievement against the state achievement standards.

2. Will the amended regulation help ensure that all students receive an equitable education? This regulation addresses the appraisal system for administrators and not does directly address whether all students receive an equitable education.

3. Will the amended regulation help to ensure that all students' health and safety are adequately protected? This regulation does not address student health or student safety.

4. Will the amended regulation help to ensure that all students' legal rights are respected? This regulation addresses the administrator appraisal system and not students' legal rights.

5. Will the amended regulation preserve the necessary authority and flexibility of decision making at the local board and school level? This regulation preserves the authority and flexibility to the extent the appraisal system is carried out at the board and school level.

6. Will the amended regulation place unnecessary reporting or administrative requirements or mandates upon decision makers at the local board and school levels? This regulation does not place unnecessary reporting or administrative requirements or mandates upon decision makers at the local board or school levels.

7. Will the decision making authority and accountability for addressing the subject to be regulated be placed in the same entity? The decision-making and accountability for the administrator appraisal system is maintained at the local board or charter school level.

8. Will the amended regulation be consistent with and not an impediment to the implementation of other state educational policies, in particular to state educational policies addressing achievement in the core academic subjects of mathematics, science, language arts and social studies? This regulation does not provide an impediment to the implementation of other state educational policies.

9. Is there a less burdensome method for addressing the purpose of the regulation? This regulation reflects information provided by an evaluation of the pilot, which has resulted in streamlining the process.

10. What is the cost to the State and to the local school boards of compliance with the regulation?

There are no additional costs to the local school boards or charter schools in complying with this regulation.

108 Administrator Appraisal Process Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II)

1.0 The Administrator Appraisal Process Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II) shall be effective for only those districts participating in the pilot of this process

1.1 For administrators participating in the pilot, any rating received on a Summative Evaluation conducted during the pilot period shall not be included in the determination of a pattern of ineffective administration as defined in 7.0.

1.2 For purposes of this regulation, an administrator is a professional employee of a board in a supervisory capacity involving the oversight of an instructional program(s).

2.0 Definitions

“Board” shall mean the local board of education or charter school board of directors.

“Certified Evaluator” shall mean the individual, usually the supervisor of the administrator, who has successfully completed the evaluation training in accordance with 9.0. A superintendent shall be evaluated by member(s) of the local school board of education who shall also have successfully completed the evaluation training in accordance with 9.0.

“DPAS” shall mean the Delaware Performance Appraisal System in effect prior to DPAS II.

“Experienced Administrator” shall mean an administrator who has three (3) or more years of service as an administrator.

“Formative Process” shall consist of the Goal Setting Conference, self-evaluation, a survey of staff that are supervised by the administrator, and formative conferences/reports.

“Improvement Plan” shall be the plan that an administrator and evaluator mutually develop in accordance with section 8.0.

“Inexperienced Administrator” shall mean an administrator who has less than three (3) years of service as an administrator.

“Satisfactory Component Rating” shall mean the administrator understands the concepts of the component and the administrator’s performance in that component is acceptable.

“Satisfactory Evaluation” shall be used for to qualify for a continuing license and shall be equivalent to the overall “Effective” or “Needs Improvement” rating on the Summative Evaluation.

“Summative Evaluation” shall be the rating component at the conclusion of the appraisal cycle.

“Technical Assistance Document” shall mean the manual that contains the prescribed forms, detailed procedures, evaluation criteria and other relevant documents that assist in the appraisal process.

“Unsatisfactory Component Rating” shall mean the administrator does not understand the concepts of the component and the administrator’s performance in that component is not acceptable.

“Unsatisfactory Evaluation” shall be the equivalent to the overall “Ineffective” rating on the Summative Evaluation.

3.0 Appraisal Cycles

3.1 Experienced administrators who have earned a rating of “Effective” on their most recent Summative Evaluation shall go through a minimum of one (1) Formative Process each year with a Summative Evaluation at the end of the one year period. This minimum annual evaluation may be waived for the subsequent year but not for two (2) consecutive years. Up to one half of the experienced administrators in a building who received a rating of “Effective” or “Exemplary” on the most recent Summative Evaluation may have the annual Summative Evaluation waived.

3.2 Experienced administrators who have earned a rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective” on their most recent Summative Evaluation shall go through a minimum of two (2) Formative Process(es) with a Summative Evaluation at the end of the one year period. These administrators shall have an Improvement Plan which may require an administrator to go through additional Formative Process(es) or other types of monitoring as outlined in the Technical Assistance Document.

3.3 Inexperienced administrators shall go through a minimum of two (2) Formative Process(es) with a Summative Evaluation at the end of the one year period. Inexperienced administrators who have earned a rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective” on their most recent Summative Evaluation shall have an Improvement Plan

which may require an administrator go through additional Formative Process(es) or other types of monitoring as outlined in the Technical Assistance Document.

4.0 Technical Assistance Document

4.1 All districts and charter schools shall use the document entitled *Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS) II Technical Assistance Document* as developed by the Department of Education to assist in the implementation of the appraisal system. The Technical Assistance Document shall be reviewed biannually by the State Board of Education. Any recommendations for change shall be submitted to the Department of Education for consideration.

4.1.1 The Document shall contain at a minimum the following:

4.1.1.1 Specific details about each of the four (4) components pursuant to 5.0.

4.1.1.2 All forms or documents needed to complete the requirements of the appraisal process including the Formative Process, Summative Evaluation, Improvement Plan and Challenge Form.

4.1.1.3 Specific procedures for the Formative Process, conferences, ratings, Summative Evaluation, Improvement Plan(s), and Challenges.

5.0 Appraisal Criteria

5.1 The following four (4) components shall be the basis upon which the performance of an administrator shall be evaluated by a certified evaluator(s):

5.1.1 Assessment of Leader Standards: This relates to the Delaware Standards for School Leaders as defined in 14 **DE Admin Code** 1594.

5.1.2 Assessment of Goals and Priorities: Professional goals that have been established based on a variety of data sources related to the need of the school or district administrator and his/her job responsibilities.

5.1.3 Assessment on the School or District Improvement Plan: The various goals and objectives in the school or district improvement plan(s) and the contributions of the administrator in achieving those goals.

5.1.4 Assessment on Measures of Student Improvement:

5.1.4.1 Student improvement on the DSTP as determined by school or district accountability ratings, and student performance on the DSTP as reported in DSTP-OR.

5.1.4.2 Student learning on district adopted norm and criterion-referenced assessments. Assessments selected by districts to measure quality and equity of student learning across all content areas.

5.1.4.3 Other measures of student performance that are used by teachers in the school are standards based and DSTP-like.

5.2 Each of the four (4) components shall be equally weighted and assigned a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on the Summative Evaluation.

5.2.1 Assessment of Leader Standards:

5.2.1.1 A satisfactory rating for this component shall mean the aggregated assessment on the Delaware Performance Appraisal System surveys from those individuals who the administrator supervises, the administrator himself/herself, and the supervisor reveal a pattern of proficient or accomplished skills on the Delaware Standards for School Leaders.

5.2.2 Assessment of Goals and Priorities:

5.2.2.1 There is adequate progress on the administrator's professional goals.

5.2.3 Assessment on the School or District Improvement Plan:

5.2.3.1 There is growth in the goals and objectives in the school or district improvement plan.

5.2.4 Assessment on Measures of Student Improvement:

5.2.4.1 A satisfactory rating for this component shall mean the administrator demonstrates acceptable performance by meeting 5.2.4.1.1 and 5.2.4.1.2 and by meeting at least 4 of the additional 5 criteria set forth below.

5.2.4.1.1 DSTP results show student performance has improved.

5.2.4.1.2 Based on the formula for obtaining the school accountability rating, there are consistent indicators of improvement in school accountability.

- 5.2.4.1.3 Makes progress on targets for student improvement on the DSTP.
- 5.2.4.1.4 There is improvement on goals established for the equitable distribution of learning outcomes based on race, gender, socio-economic status, special education status and language proficiency.
- 5.2.4.1.5 There is consistent evidence of improvement on district-adopted norm and criterion-referenced assessments.
- 5.2.4.1.6 There is improvement in the percent of students who are meeting the targets for school or district accountability.
- 5.2.4.1.7 There is improvement on student attendance or graduation rates.

6.0 Summative Evaluation Ratings

6.1 The Summative Evaluation shall include ratings of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on each of the four (4) components pursuant to 5.0.

6.2 The Summative Evaluation shall also include one of three overall ratings: "Effective", "Needs Improvement" or "Ineffective".

6.2.1 Effective shall mean that the administrator has received Satisfactory Component ratings in all four (4) components of the appraisal criteria.

6.2.2 Needs Improvement shall mean that the administrator has received one (1) Unsatisfactory Component rating out of the four (4) components of the appraisal criteria.

6.2.2.1 An administrator who has received an unsatisfactory rating on the student improvement component may have their next Summative Evaluation delayed until the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) data is available.

6.2.3 Ineffective shall mean that the administrator has received two (2) or more Unsatisfactory Component ratings out of the four (4) components of the appraisal criteria.

6.2.3.1 An administrator who has received an unsatisfactory rating on the student improvement component may have their next Summative Evaluation delayed until the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) data is available.

6.2.3.2 If an administrator's overall Summative Evaluation rating is determined to be "Needs Improvement" for the third consecutive year, the rating shall be re-categorized as Ineffective.

7.0 A Pattern of Ineffective Administrative Performance

A Pattern of Ineffective Administrative Performance shall be based on the most recent appraisal ratings of an administrator using the DPAS II process. Two consecutive ratings of Ineffective shall be deemed as a pattern of ineffective administration. The following appraisal ratings shall be determined to be a pattern of ineffective administration:

Ineffective	Ineffective	
Needs Improvement	Ineffective	Needs Improvement
Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement	Ineffective
Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement
Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Ineffective
Needs Improvement	Ineffective	Ineffective

8.0 Improvement Plan

8.1 An Improvement Plan shall be developed for an administrator who receives an overall rating of Needs Improvement or Ineffective on the Summative Evaluation or a rating of Unsatisfactory (Unsatisfactory Component Rating) on any component on the Summative Evaluation regardless of the overall rating.

8.1.4 An Improvement Plan shall also be developed if an administrator's performance during the Formative Process is unsatisfactory. This unsatisfactory performance shall be noted by the evaluator(s) on the Formative Feedback form by typing "PERFORMANCE IS UNSATISFACTORY" and initialing the statement.

8.2 The Improvement Plan shall contain the following:

8.2.1 Identification of the specific deficiencies and recommended area(s) for growth;

8.2.2 Measurable goals for improving the deficiencies to satisfactory levels;

8.2.3 Specific professional development or activities to accomplish the goals;

8.2.4 Specific resources necessary to implement the plan, including but not limited to, opportunities for the administrator to work with curriculum specialist(s) or other administrator(s) with relevant experience;

8.2.5 Procedures and evidence that must be collected to determine that the goals of the plan were met;

8.2.6 Timeline for the plan, including intermediate check points to determine progress;

8.2.7 Procedures for determining satisfactory improvement.

8.3 The Improvement Plan shall be developed cooperatively by the administrator and evaluator. If the plan cannot be cooperatively developed, the evaluator shall have the authority and responsibility to determine the plan as specified in 8.2 above.

8.4 The administrator shall be held accountable for the implementation and completion of the Improvement Plan.

8.5 Upon completion of the Improvement Plan, the administrator and evaluator(s) shall sign the documentation that determines the satisfactory or unsatisfactory completion of the plan.

9.0 Evaluator(s) Credentials

9.1 Evaluators shall have completed the DPAS II training as developed by the Department of Education. Evaluators shall receive a certificate of completion which is valid for five (5) years and is renewable upon completion of professional development focused on DPAS II as specified by the Department of Education.

9.2 The training for the certificate of completion shall include techniques for observation and conferencing, content and relationships of ISLLC standards, and a thorough review of the Technical Assistance Document. Activities in which participants practice implementation of DPAS II procedures shall be included in the training.

9.3 The credentialing process shall be conducted by the Department of Education.

10.0 Challenge Process

10.1 An administrator may challenge any rating on the Summative Evaluation, either a Component Rating or the Overall Rating, or an administrator may challenge the conclusions of the Formative Process if the statement "PERFORMANCE IS UNSATISFACTORY" has been included on the Formative Feedback form by submitting additional information specific to the point of disagreement in writing within ten (10) working days of the date of administrator's receipt of the Summative Evaluation. Such written response shall become part of the appraisal record and shall be attached to the Summative Evaluation. All challenges together with the record shall be forwarded to the supervisor of the evaluator.

10.1.1 Within ten (10) working days of receiving the written challenge, the supervisor of the evaluator shall review the record which consists of information from the Formative Process, the Summative Evaluation and the written challenge, and issue a written decision.

10.1.2 If the challenge is denied, the decision shall state the reasons for denial.

10.1.3 The decision of the supervisor of the evaluator shall be final.

8-DE Reg. 431 (9/1/04)

1.0 The Administrator Appraisal Process, Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II), shall be effective for the following school districts and charter schools beginning with the 2007-08 school year:

Appoquinimink

Caesar Rodney

Colonial

Lake Forest

Laurel

Smyrna
Sussex Technical
MOT Charter
Providence Creek Academy Charter
Sussex Academy of the Arts and Sciences

The Administrator Appraisal Process, Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II), shall be effective for all public school districts and charter schools beginning with the 2008-2009 school year.

1.1 For purposes of this regulation, an administrator shall be a professional employee authorized by a board to serve in a supervisory capacity involving the oversight of an instructional program(s).

2.0 Definitions

“Board” shall mean the local board of education or charter school board of directors.

“Credentialed Evaluator” shall mean the individual, usually the supervisor of the administrator, who has successfully completed the evaluation training in accordance with 10.0. A superintendent shall be evaluated by member(s) of the local school board of education who shall also have successfully completed the evaluation training in accordance with 10.0. The Credentialed Evaluator may also be referred to as “Evaluator”.

“DASA” shall mean the Delaware Association of School Administrators.

“DPAS II Guide for Administrators” shall mean the manual that contains the prescribed forms, detailed procedures, evaluation criteria and other relevant documents that are used to implement the appraisal process.

“DSEA” shall mean the Delaware State Education Association.

“Experienced Administrator” shall mean an administrator who has three (3) or more years of service as an administrator.

“Formative Process” shall consist of the Goal Setting Conference, self evaluation, a survey of staff that are supervised by the administrator, and formative conferences and reports as outlined in the *DPAS II Guide for Administrators*.

“Improvement Plan” shall be the plan that an administrator and evaluator mutually develop in accordance with 8.0.

“Inexperienced Administrator” shall mean an administrator who has less than three (3) years of service as an administrator.

“Satisfactory Component Rating” shall mean the administrator’s performance reflects the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of the component.

“Satisfactory Evaluation” shall be equivalent to the overall “Effective” or “Needs Improvement” rating on the Summative Evaluation.

“State Assessment” shall mean the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) or its successor.

“Summative Evaluation” shall be the rating process at the conclusion of the appraisal cycle.

“Unsatisfactory Component Rating” shall mean the administrator’s performance does not reflect the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of the component.

“Unsatisfactory Evaluation” shall be the equivalent to the overall “Ineffective” rating on the Summative Evaluation.

“Working Day” shall mean a day when the employee would normally be working in that district or charter school.

3.0 Appraisal Cycles

3.1 Experienced administrators who have earned a rating of “Effective” on his or her most recent Summative Evaluation shall receive a minimum of one (1) Formative Process each year with a Summative Evaluation at least once every two (2) years.

3.2 Experienced administrators who have earned a rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective” on their most recent Summative Evaluation shall receive a minimum of one (1) Formative Process with a Summative Evaluation at the end of the one year period. These administrators shall have an Improvement Plan which may require additional Formative Process(es) or other types of monitoring as outlined in the *DPAS II Guide for Administrators*.

3.3 Inexperienced administrators shall have a minimum of one (1) Formative Process with a Summative Evaluation at the end of the one (1) year period. Inexperienced administrators who have earned a rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective” on their most recent Summative Evaluation shall have an

Improvement Plan which may require additional Formative Process(es) or other types of monitoring as outlined in the *DPAS II Guide for Administrators*.

4.0 DPAS II Guide for Administrators

4.1 All districts and charter schools shall use the manual entitled *DPAS II Guide for Administrators* as developed and as may be amended by the Department of Education in collaboration with DSEA and DASA to implement the appraisal system.

4.1.1 The manual shall contain at a minimum the following:

4.1.1.1 Specific details about each of the five (5) components pursuant to 5.1.

4.1.1.2 All forms or documents needed to complete the requirements of the appraisal process.

4.1.1.3 Specific procedures to implement the appraisal system.

5.0 Appraisal Criteria

5.1 The following five (5) components, including the four (4) Appraisal Criteria specified for each, shall be the basis upon which the performance of an administrator shall be evaluated by a certified evaluator(s):

5.1.1 Vision and Goals

5.1.1.1 Using Data: Administrator, in collaboration with others such as the school or district improvement team or board, uses multiple sources of information and assists in analyzing data to establish rigorous and concrete school or district improvement goals in the context of student achievement and instructional programs.

5.1.1.2 Implementing Vision and Goals: Administrator provides leadership for major initiatives and change efforts relative to the school or district improvement goals. Administrator is committed to doing the work required for continuous school and district improvement.

5.1.1.3 Promoting Vision and Goals: Administrator promotes high expectations for teaching and learning. Administrator is committed to ensuring that all students have the knowledge and skills necessary to become successful in future educational activities.

5.1.1.4 Communicating the Vision and Goals: Administrator communicates effectively to appropriate stakeholders about progress towards meeting the school or district improvement plan goals. Administrator participates in a process to regularly monitor, evaluate and revise school or district improvement goals.

5.1.2 Culture of Learning

5.1.2.1 Advocating a Culture of Learning: Administrator provides leadership for assessing, developing and improving the school or district culture and instructional program that is conducive to student learning. Administrator can articulate the desired school or district instructional program and shows evidence about how he or she reinforces the instructional program and culture.

5.1.2.2 Monitoring the Culture of Learning: Administrator participates in monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the curriculum, instruction or assessment of students. Administrator evaluates staff and provides on-going coaching for improvement. Administrator uses a variety of sources of information to make decisions.

5.1.2.3 Sustaining the Culture of Learning: Administrator helps to ensure that staff have professional development opportunities that enhance their performance and improve student learning. Administrator is accessible and approachable by staff, families, and community and is visible in the school or district community. Administrator supports the use of technology as appropriate in teaching and learning.

5.1.2.4 Maintaining the Culture of Learning: Administrator systematically and fairly recognizes accomplishments of staff and students towards a positive school or district culture. Administrator uses and analyzes data to instill the importance of continually developing programs and strategies to enhance opportunities for learning.

5.1.3 Management

5.1.3.1 Solving Problems or Concerns: Administrator addresses and resolves issues as they arise in a timely manner and works to prevent potential problems. Operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for learning for all students.

5.1.3.2 Managing Resources: Administrator manages fiscal and physical resources responsibly, efficiently and effectively. Administrator protects instructional time by managing operational

procedures in such a way as to maximize learning. Administrator efficiently manages his or her time so that teaching and learning are a high priority.

5.1.3.3 Complying with Policies: Administrator complies with federal, state, and board policies. School or district contractual agreements are effectively managed. Administrator maintains confidentiality and privacy of school or district records, including student or staff information.

5.1.3.4 Protecting the Welfare and Safety of Students and Staff: Administrator works to ensure a safe and secure school or district environment and a culture that is conducive to teaching and learning. Challenges that could potentially interrupt teaching and learning are addressed and resolved.

5.1.4 Professional Responsibilities

5.1.4.1 Maintaining Professional Relationships: Administrator fosters and maintains positive professional relationships with staff. Administrator is respectful of other's opinions and demonstrates an appreciation for and sensitivity to diversity in the school or district community.

5.1.4.2 Promoting Family and Community Involvement: Administrator collaboratively works to establish a culture that encourages and welcomes families and community members and seeks ways in which to engage them in student learning.

5.1.4.3 Demonstrating Fairness: Administrator is fair and consistent when dealing with students and staff. Administrator demonstrates values, beliefs and attitudes that inspire all students and staff to higher levels of performance.

5.1.4.4 Growing and Developing Professionally: Administrator chooses and participates in professional development that is aligned with his or her professional needs or aligned with the needs of the school or district.

5.1.5 Student Improvement

5.1.5.1 Showing Student Improvement: Administrator uses school or district goals from the school or district improvement process to set his or her personal annual data driven goal(s) for student improvement. Data shall include school or district accountability data, State Assessment data, or other assessment data.

5.1.5.2 Measuring Student Improvement: Administrator has specific, measurable evidence to show progress towards or attainment of goal(s) for student improvement.

5.1.5.3 Implementing Strategies for Student Improvement: Administrator designs and implements appropriate strategies to show progress towards or attainment of goal(s) for student improvement.

5.1.5.4 Reflecting on Student Improvement: Administrator reflects on goal setting process and outcomes for the purpose of continuous professional improvement and shares student improvement information as appropriate.

6.0 Summative Evaluation Ratings

6.1 Each of the five (5) components pursuant to 5.0 shall be weighted equally and assigned a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on the Summative Evaluation.

6.1.1 A satisfactory rating for each component shall mean the administrator demonstrates acceptable performance by meeting at least three (3) of the four (4) Appraisal Criteria specified in each of the five (5) components set forth in 5.1.

6.2 The Summative Evaluation shall also include one of three overall ratings: "Effective", "Needs Improvement" or "Ineffective".

6.2.1 "Effective" shall mean that the administrator has received Satisfactory Component ratings in at least four (4) of the five (5) components in accordance with the Appraisal Criteria in 5.0.

6.2.2 "Needs Improvement" shall mean that the administrator has received three (3) Satisfactory Component ratings out of the five (5) components in accordance with the Appraisal Criteria in 5.0.

6.2.3 "Ineffective" shall mean that the administrator has received two (2) or fewer Satisfactory Component ratings out of the five (5) components in accordance with the Appraisal Criteria in 5.0.

6.2.3.1 If an administrator's overall Summative Evaluation rating is determined to be "Needs Improvement" for the third consecutive year, the rating shall be re-categorized as "Ineffective".

7.0 Pattern of Ineffective Administrative Performance

A pattern of ineffective administrative performance shall be based on the most recent Summative Evaluation ratings of an administrator using the DPAS II process. Two consecutive ratings of "Ineffective" shall be

deemed as a pattern of ineffective administration. The following chart shows the consecutive Summative Evaluation ratings determined to be a pattern of ineffective administrative performance:

<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>
<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Ineffective</u>	
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Ineffective</u>
<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Ineffective</u>
<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Ineffective</u>

8.0 Improvement Plan

8.1 An Improvement Plan shall be developed for an administrator who receives an overall rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Ineffective" on the Summative Evaluation or a rating of Unsatisfactory on any component in 5.0 on the Summative Evaluation regardless of the overall rating.

8.1.1 An Improvement Plan shall also be developed if an administrator's overall performance during the Formative Process is unsatisfactory. This unsatisfactory performance shall be noted by the evaluator(s) on the Formative Feedback form by noting "PERFORMANCE IS UNSATISFACTORY" and initialing the statement.

8.2 The Improvement Plan shall contain the following:

8.2.1 Identification of the specific deficiencies and recommended area(s) for growth;

8.2.2 Measurable goals for improving the deficiencies to satisfactory levels;

8.2.3 Specific professional development or activities to accomplish the goals;

8.2.4 Specific resources necessary to implement the plan, including but not limited to, opportunities for the administrator to work with curriculum specialist(s) or others with relevant experience;

8.2.5 Procedures and evidence that must be collected to determine that the goals of the plan were met;

8.2.6 Timeline for the plan, including intermediate check points to determine progress;

8.2.7 Procedures for determining satisfactory improvement.

8.3 The Improvement Plan shall be developed cooperatively by the administrator and evaluator. If the plan cannot be cooperatively developed, the evaluator shall have the authority and responsibility to determine the plan as specified in 8.2 above.

8.4 The administrator shall be held accountable for the implementation and completion of the Improvement Plan.

8.5 Upon completion of the Improvement Plan, the administrator and evaluator(s) shall sign the documentation that determines the satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance of the plan.

9.0 Challenge Process

9.1 An administrator may challenge any rating on the Summative Evaluation, either a Component Rating or the Overall Rating, or an administrator may challenge the conclusions of the Formative Process if the statement "PERFORMANCE IS UNSATISFACTORY" has been included on the Formative Feedback form. To initiate a challenge, an administrator shall submit additional information specific to the point of disagreement in writing within fifteen (15) working days of the date of administrator's receipt of the Summative Evaluation. Such written response shall become part of the appraisal record and shall be attached to the Summative Evaluation. All challenges together with the record shall be forwarded to the supervisor of the evaluator, if any.

9.1.1 Within fifteen (15) working days of receiving the written challenge, the supervisor of the evaluator shall review the record which consists of all documents used in the appraisal and the written challenge, and issue a written decision.

9.1.2 If the challenge is denied, the written decision shall state the reasons for denial.

9.1.3 The decision of the supervisor of the evaluator shall be final.

10.0 Evaluator(s) Credentials

10.1 Evaluators shall have completed the DPAS II training as developed by the Department of Education. Evaluators shall receive a certificate of completion which is valid for five (5) years and is renewable upon completion of professional development focused on DPAS II as specified by the Department of Education.

10.2 The training for the certificate of completion shall include techniques for observation and conferencing, content and relationships of ISLLC standards, and a thorough review of the *DPAS II Guide for Administrators*. Activities in which participants practice implementation of DPAS II procedures shall be included in the training.

10.3 The credentialing process shall be conducted by the Department of Education.

8 DE Reg. 431 (9/1/04)

11 DE Reg. 143 (08/01/07) (Prop.)