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September 25, 2014

Over the past year, we have come together to make significant progress on behalf of our students. They are graduating high school at higher rates, receiving financial support when applying to college, challenging themselves with more access and opportunity for college coursework, and showing more growth in reading and math than ever before. Across the state, we are witnessing the limitless possibilities for our students, and Delaware families are responding to this momentum. It is an exciting time to be working on behalf of the state of Delaware.

Decades of research have illuminated what makes our schools great - the people inside of them. Research shows that teachers are the most important school-related factor in the academic success of our students, with school principals right behind them. People drive progress in public education, and our students and families put great trust in the hands of educational leaders and classroom teachers every single day. Our educational system is only as strong as the educators who work with our students every day.

That is why it is essential that we have an educator evaluation system that leads to an accurate assessment of the quality of practice and results our educators demonstrate. It can lead us toward better feedback, more robust support, and accelerated student learning. A strong system also creates data that informs educator recruitment and retention, while also informing resource allocation decisions around how best to support our schools. Delaware has had an educator evaluation system for nearly twenty-five years, and over the past five years we have committed to incorporating student growth measures into our processes in order to assess academic progress. Hundreds of educators came together to help us develop these measures, and the opportunity to create new or alternative measures is now available to all educators as they consider which assessments are the best indicators of their students' success. By combining educator practice and student growth, our evaluation system has become more rich and meaningful.

This report shows us that our collectively-developed evaluation system has placed an emphasis on individual student success. Educators meet with their school leaders each fall, set goals for student growth, and evaluate that growth in the spring and summer. Not surprisingly, the growth teachers made with their students varied. However, differences in performance and strategies amongst educators were not readily identified by school leaders. And our student improvement ratings showed little variance when multiple measures were combined. As an education community, these points raise many questions about our integrity to the intended process and should prompt greater urgency regarding implementation.

That said, we should collectively celebrate the hard work and dedication our educators have shown in implementing this revised system over the past two years. It is hard work. As I visit schools, I see educators collaborating in their professional learning communities, data posted on walls as a reminder of the goals they have set, and talented school leaders conducting classroom observations and providing meaningful feedback in the spirit of teacher and student development.

Educator performance matters because we know that the quality of teaching is at the heart of our school system. But student success will not be achieved without deep coaching and feedback in our schools and without addressing matters of performance at the policy-level. This report sits at the cross-section of those two ideas and merits full consideration by every stakeholder in the Delaware education community.

Sincerely,

Mark Murphy, Secretary of Education
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The 2013-14 school year marked the second year in which all teachers, specialists, and administrators in Delaware were evaluated using the revised Delaware Performance Appraisal System-Two (DPAS-II). Though DPAS-II had been in effect in various forms since the 1980s, its previous iterations never reached the level of comprehensive statewide implementation seen over the last two years. The revised version of DPAS-II expected every educator and administrator in Delaware to assess their impact on student improvement in a manner that was unprecedented in the state. Every educator in Delaware was now required to have conversations with their evaluator about the type of student growth he or she wanted to see and how they would hold themselves accountable for helping students reach these goals. All educators had access to hundreds of pre- and post-assessments created by Delaware educators that could be used to measure their students’ growth. Teachers of math and English (in grades 3-10) received individualized student growth targets for the DCAS that accounted for where each student started and indicated the type of growth similar students made in previous years.

These changes were not without controversy or implementation challenges. This deeper connection between educator performance and student learning outcomes is what was envisioned by policymakers and stakeholders in 2010 as Senate Bill 263 passed, thus refining the Student Improvement component of DPAS-II evaluations (also referred to as Component V). The simple idea underpinning these system improvements was that student and teacher performance matters and a meaningful appraisal system needs to be able to detect varied levels of effectiveness, help educators improve, and connect teaching practice to student outcomes.

The imperative for such a student-centered evaluation system is clear. Only 19 percent of Delaware’s students meet the “college-ready” benchmark on the SAT (now taken statewide by all high school juniors). More than half of Delaware public school students who enroll in the state's colleges need remedial courses, and racial and socio-economic achievement gaps persist throughout the state’s schools. Yet, while Delaware has been able to ensure a statewide focus on student improvement via DPAS-II and achieve comprehensive statewide implementation over the past two years, the “Year One” results captured in *Continuous Improvement* did not reflect a system ready to acknowledge and address differences in performance. 99 percent of educators were rated “Highly-Effective” or “Effective.” When educators set their own goals for student growth they were more likely to receive high ratings than when using a more objective measure of student growth. And when the DPAS-II system allowed for evaluator discretion in an educator’s rating there was a statewide tendency to upgrade educators to higher ratings.

**The challenge for the 2013-14 school year, in response to these findings, was evident:** implement the system in a manner that reflects high expectations for student improvement and professional growth.
This report—*Performance Matters*—provides an analysis of the second year of statewide implementation of the revised DPAS-II system using student achievement data, educators’ evaluation ratings, and educators’ responses to an annual survey about the DPAS-II process.

This year’s results show that educators and policy leaders are getting more specific information about performance as a result of new regulations requiring criterion-level ratings. The results also show that the state-defined measures of student growth are providing actionable information about educators and schools with exemplary performance and those in need of support to serve students more effectively. At the same time, the results show that there is more work to be done, as a meaningful level of differentiation was not evident in the traditional teacher evaluation metrics (Components I-IV), which resulted in overall ratings that showed little variation in teaching quality. Nearly all educators received positive ratings on classroom observations (criteria and component-level), and where evaluators had the opportunity to exercise professional judgment (i.e. student growth goal-setting by educators or administrator discretion to upgrade ratings) it generally led to higher ratings and less variation. This makes it harder to help educators improve. And while Component V data is showing some meaningful differentiation in student growth measures defined by the state (“Measure A”), the report outlines how these potential opportunities for improvement are consistently and ultimately deemed “Effective.”

The key findings about the DPAS-II system discussed in the report include:

**Educators and administrators recognize the impact of improvements to the DPAS-II system:**

- The amendments to Regulations 106A/107A which took effect in July 2013 were received positively by educators based on the DPAS-II annual survey.
- 66 percent of teachers believe the increased flexibility with unannounced observations has saved time and 61 percent believe that it has improved feedback opportunities.
- 72 percent of administrators believe that the requirement to give criterion-level ratings in 2013-14 allowed for meaningful conversations about growth. Nearly two-thirds of administrators believe that the addition of credentialed observers has been valuable to the process.

**There was more variation among educators in the state-defined metric for student growth than in measures of student growth where targets were set by educators and their evaluators:**

- Using only the state-defined measure of student growth based on the Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (Measure A) for educators in math and English (grades 3-10), 32 percent of educators received an “Exceeds” rating, 39 percent were rated “Satisfactory,” 22 percent “Unsatisfactory with administrator discretion” and 7 percent “Unsatisfactory.”
• For the other student growth measures, defined using targets set by an educator and their evaluator, the vast majority of educators received “Satisfactory” or “Exceeds” ratings: 94 percent for Measure B and 99 percent for Measure C.

• When the state set student growth targets (Measure A), more educators were rated “Unsatisfactory” than when educators and evaluators set growth targets (Measures B). Specifically, only 8 percent of educators who were rated “Unsatisfactory” on Measure A were also rated “Unsatisfactory” on Measure B. 61 percent of educators who were rated “Unsatisfactory” on Measure A were rated “Exceeds” on Measure B. 31 percent of that same group were “Satisfactory” on Measure B when Measure A was “Unsatisfactory.”

• Ninety-nine percent of Delaware educators received “Satisfactory” ratings on each of the four components based upon classroom observations and professional responsibilities (Components I – IV). There is almost no variation across districts in the percent of educators with four “Satisfactory” ratings on the qualitative components of the evaluation system (as assessed by school and district leadership).

• While the newly-required criterion-level ratings provided a more nuanced picture of performance, on each of the 18 DPAS-II criteria, the overwhelming majority of educators are “Proficient” or “Distinguished.”

• Overall, 51 percent of educators received the newly-created “Highly-effective” rating and 48% received an “Effective” rating. Only 1% of educators received a rating of “Needs Improvement.”

Where the DPAS-II system allowed for evaluator discretion in an educator’s rating, administrators overwhelmingly opted to upgrade to higher ratings.

• Evaluators opted to upgrade an educator’s rating to “Satisfactory” in 85 percent of the instances where a “Satisfactory” rating on one measure of student growth and “Unsatisfactory” on the other needed to be combined for a final Component V rating.

• Across the state, 72 percent of educators whose Measure A rating were initially “Unsatisfactory with administrator discretion” were upgraded to “Satisfactory” ratings by their evaluators. In four districts, teachers were upgraded to “Satisfactory” at least 85 percent of the time.

• Taking these decisions into account, educators’ overall ratings on the student growth component (Component V) showed that 51 percent were rated “Exceeds,” 48 percent were rated “Satisfactory”, and 1 percent were rated “Unsatisfactory.”

While the majority of educators find value in the DPAS-II system and the student growth Component V for improving their teaching, they vast majority believe the system needs improvement.
• 61 percent of teachers and 67 percent of administrators thought that the DPAS-II system was one of the top five drivers of student achievement gains.

• Across the state, 53 percent of teachers felt that the DPAS-II system had “some” or a “major” impact on improving their teaching. This rate was higher among administrators, with 64 percent of them reporting that the system has “some” or a “major” impact on improving practice.

• 72 percent of teachers, 64 percent of specialists, and 77 percent of administrators found the feedback they received through the formal DPAS-II process to be useful.

• However, only 28 percent of teachers, 23 percent of specialists, and 22 percent of administrators think that the system should be “continued in its current form.” 63 percent of teachers gave the DPAS-II system a passing grade (C or better) but the most common grade received was a C (given by 38% of teachers) for the second consecutive year.

These results highlight the importance of the work, the need for continuing improvement of the evaluation system, and the need to build capacity in Delaware schools and districts to implement the system well. Although the system provides some meaningful data about student growth in educators’ classrooms, that data is not translating into meaningfully differentiated results in the overall rating system.

The Department continues to solicit feedback—the state’s educators express different perspectives, but the consistent theme is that the system needs improvement (to allow for more focus, differentiation based on roles and experience, peer observation, and emphasis on educator development). To address these concerns, the report concludes with some of the efforts underway or on the horizon to strengthen the DPAS-II system. These efforts include continued funding for coaches to support school leaders with the evaluation process, specific training in student growth goal-setting, and a new statewide Credentialing Assessment for evaluators.

The efforts also include the strengthening of alternative assessments used to measure student growth, an approval process for districts to use alternative evaluation systems to meet the needs of their educators, and recent amendments to regulations to allow for alternative designs for Component IV (e.g. student surveys). Thus, the work of improving educator evaluation in Delaware continues at the school, district, and state levels, making the necessary adjustments to drive stronger implementation in the years ahead.
BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION

Delaware students are achieving greater levels of academic success. A larger share of students—particularly the lowest performing students—reached their individual growth targets in reading and mathematics in 2013-14 than the previous year, more students are taking and passing Advancement Placement exams than ever, the share of students off-track to graduate after ninth grade has decreased each year, and the dropout rate in the state reached a 30-year low in 2014. There is also early evidence that more Delaware students who demonstrate college readiness are applying to college. Such outcomes are the result of the hard work of Delaware educators and the collective focus of all concerned parties—parents, community representatives, and district and state policy leaders—on the growth and development of Delaware’s students.

With students’ long-term success at the forefront of the statewide discussion about Delaware’s educational improvement, any appreciation of recent gains is tempered by evidence that many Delaware students are not ready for success in college and careers. More than half of Delaware public school students who enroll in the state’s colleges have to take remedial courses that are not credit-bearing. While this is concerning, perhaps more alarming is that only 30 percent of Delaware high school freshmen make it to their sophomore year of college and only 17 percent of low-income ninth-graders persist to their second year of college. As the state, districts, and educators review these indicators, it is clear that there is substantial work to be done to raise standards and prepare Delaware students for academic, career, and life success.

To continue to raise standards and ensure our students are prepared for college and careers, an emphasis on educator effectiveness and performance is imperative. Research indicates that teacher effectiveness has a larger impact on student achievement than other factors within the direct control of school systems (e.g. class size, the school a student attends, etc.). The evidence base on teacher effectiveness has been consistent: Performance Matters. In an analysis of five years of Delaware teacher and student achievement data (the “Delaware Educator Diagnostic: An Analysis for the First State’s Workforce”) released in 2013, teacher impact on student achievement was found to vary widely across the state. In some cases, the difference in student growth in some classrooms amounted to a difference in a year of learning.

Delaware has been a leading state for many years in acknowledging this critical role educators play by recognizing that their professional growth and continuous learning is essential for successful schools. Over the past three decades Delaware has implemented an annual statewide educator evaluation system, Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS), which was based upon the principles of the Charlotte Danielson framework. This system was designed to help

2 http://www.delawareonline.com/story/news/education/2014/02/19/more-del-students-tackling-advanced-placement-courses/5623465/
5 http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/10/upshot/a-case-study-in-lifting-college-attendance.html?abt=0002&abg=1
educators receive the feedback and coaching needed to be effective in their work. DPAS was revised to form “DPAS-II” and was piloted in 2005-2006 based on feedback from educators. It was ultimately launched statewide in 2008.

Over the past few years, the state has invested in the continuous improvement of the DPAS-II system given its strategic importance in combination with other efforts underway to improve practice and access to the most effective teachers (professional development, educator preparation program reform, teacher recruitment, compensation reform, etc.). A revised DPAS-II system would identify strengths and weaknesses in educator practice, triangulate this information with student growth/performance data to tailor professional development for educators and ultimately inform decisions regarding promotion, advancement, retention and separation.

The imperative for improving the DPAS-II system was also prompted by evidence that it was not matching its promise as a driver of professional growth and ultimately student achievement. Each year 99 percent of educators were rated “Effective” using the DPAS-II system. The nearly uniform “Effective” ratings received by Delaware teachers each year were a stark contrast to the rates of proficiency and college readiness seen among Delaware students. In an attempt to address this disconnect and place a stronger focus on student learning in the DPAS-II process, Senate Bill 263 was passed in 2010, thus refining the Student Improvement component of DPAS-II evaluations—also referred to as Component Five (Component V).

DPAS-II evaluations are comprised of five components grounded in Charlotte Danielson’s “Framework for Effective Teaching,” with components I-IV ratings determined by observations by an educator’s evaluator. Prior to changes to Delaware state code and regulation in 2010, Component V (Student Improvement) was implemented with limited rigor and comparability at the local level, only sometimes determined based upon goals for student learning set by a teacher and approved by his or her evaluator. Unlike Components I-IV, where evaluations were designed to be determined based upon an educator performance rubric, there was little guidance as to how to evaluate student improvement for Component V. As a result, there was significant variability in how Component V was implemented across schools and classrooms and the types of evidence collected to support an educator’s rating. Some educators across the state were engaging in rich conversations about their impact on student improvement during the DPAS-II appraisal process while others were not receiving critical or constructive feedback grounded in student performance. Student growth was not a crucial factor in determining educator performance—and in some cases it was a non-factor. This meant that in many cases educators received “Effective” ratings with limited to no evidence of student improvement.

Component V was therefore given significant attention as the state reformed the DPAS-II process. Under new regulations, no educator could receive an “Effective” or the newly-created “Highly-effective” rating without “Satisfactory” levels of student growth. The student improvement component would now also require a measurement of student growth using the statewide assessment for administrators and teachers in tested subjects (mathematics and English language arts). These targets were calculated based on a student’s past performance as well as the performance of similar students over the prior two years. See page 16 for more information about how these targets were set.

---

8 This measure included individual student growth targets for each student in grades 3-10 for math and English language arts. These targets were calculated based on a student’s past performance as well as the performance of similar students over the prior two years. See page 16 for more information about how these targets were set.
language arts) and other rigorous measures of student learning for non-tested subjects and grades. The revised system took effect in the 2012-2013 school year and required every educator, specialist and administrator to have “multiple measures” of student growth included in his or her performance appraisal.

These changes to the state’s educator evaluation system were a major undertaking and required the support of the many stakeholders. The implementation process was complex and challenges were abundant. Assessments to measure student growth needed to be developed and disseminated, advisory committees representing myriad stakeholder groups needed to be convened, trainings needed to be designed and conducted, and districts and schools needed to communicate and implement the changes to the system. To Delaware’s advantage, the state had a strong record of stakeholder engagement and collaboration with districts, charters, the Delaware State Education Association (DSEA) and Delaware Association of School Administrators (DASA). The communication and collaboration between these groups was critical for successful implementation of the revised system and its continued success.

This report, *Performance Matters*, presents the results of the 2013-14 implementation of DPAS-II. This includes comparisons with 2012-13 DPAS-II results (discussed in the Year One report “Continuous Improvement”) and information collected from the annual DPAS-II Process Evaluation survey (educator perception/input).

The first section of this report provides an overview of the DPAS-II system and the changes to Component V that occurred primarily during the 2012-2013 school year. It provides details on the goals of the DPAS-II system and the policy guiding statewide implementation. The second section provides data on the distribution of educator ratings for Components I-V and compares these ratings with student achievement data. The subsequent sections include an analysis of data on the student growth component (Component V) and the distribution of overall summative ratings. The final two sections begin to look ahead at how the DPAS-II system can be improved. The first of these sections considers improvements suggested through data from the annual DPAS-II educator survey and the concluding section outlines policy changes and educator supports already being executed in 2014-2015. A “closer look” addendum with DPAS-II results for Delaware charter schools and for the four charters using an approved alternative evaluation system (the Teaching Excellence Framework) is provided at the end of the report.
A. OVERVIEW OF DPAS-II & “COMPONENT V”

Delaware’s performance appraisal system has been in place in some form since the 1980s with a goal to assure educators’ professional growth and quality educators in every classroom. In addition to naming the standards for effective teaching and school leadership, DPAS-II provides a forum for collection of evidence needed to make important decisions such as:

- Recognizing and praising outstanding practice
- Recommending continued employment and/or career growth opportunities
- Recommending strategies and/or activities that will enhance effectiveness
- Beginning educator termination proceedings
- Determining the type of professional development needed at a school/district

The DPAS-II system for teachers and specialists is largely based on the work of Charlotte Danielson (Framework for Teaching). For each group, DPAS-II has five appraisal components. The first four components of DPAS-II for teachers and specialists are grounded in the Danielson Framework; the fifth is Student Improvement. The DPAS-II Appraisal Components for teachers, specialists, and administrators are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component I</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and</td>
<td>Planning and</td>
<td>Vision and Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component II</td>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>The Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component III</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Delivery of Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component IV</td>
<td>Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td>Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component V</td>
<td>Student Improvement</td>
<td>Student Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom observations\(^9\) form the basis of teachers’ ratings on the first four DPAS-II components\(^10\) on which teachers can receive either a “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” rating. A teacher or specialist’s rating (either “Exceeds,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory”) on

---

9 Evidence for performance on Components I-III for teachers and specialists is gathered through observation by administrators (novice teachers receive three observations and experienced teachers receive two), which usually follows a pre-observation form, pre-conference and a formative feedback conference. For Component IV, all educators complete a professional responsibilities form, which details their professional growth, communication with students, parents, and school colleagues, and their contributions to the professional community during the review period.

10 Under each component are criteria observed by a teacher’s evaluator using a rubric defining “Unsatisfactory,” “Basic,” “Proficient” and “Distinguished” performance
Component V is based on multiple measures of student growth during the year\textsuperscript{11}. These measures will be discussed in further detail. A teacher or specialist can receive any of the summative ratings (Highly-Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement or Ineffective) during their “Summative Evaluation”, which occurs every other year for “Experienced” educators and every year for “Novice” educators. The five DPAS-II components combined form the basis of a summative rating, as outlined in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Satisfactory ratings in Components I-IV</th>
<th>Component V</th>
<th>Summative Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The newly-created rating of “Highly-Effective” was implemented for the first time in the 2012-2013 school year. Another important change in 2012-2013 was that an educator could not earn a summative rating of “Effective” if they had an “Unsatisfactory” rating in Component V. The opposite also was true. An educator could not be rated “Ineffective” if his or her Component V rating was “Satisfactory.”

\textsuperscript{11} Administrators’ Component V ratings are also based on student growth, though administrators have the option of using multiple measures or a single measure (DCAS results).
Overview of Component V

The most significant changes occurred within Component V (Student Improvement) of the DPAS-II system. In the 2012-13 (“Year One”) and 2013-14, all educators were required to show evidence of student growth as a part of their DPAS-II evaluation. All educators would receive Component V ratings annually, even during an “off-year” for a summative evaluation. As discussed, state regulations required that measures of student growth be included in the DPAS-II evaluation process. However, defining fair and appropriate measures and targets for student growth for all educators is complex. The current framework, which requires multiple measures of student growth as a basis for Component V ratings, was the result of significant collaboration among educators (in all grades and subjects), policymakers, and content facilitators at the DDOE.

The current framework for Component V places educators into three distinct groups with three different measures available for Component V implementation. Policy implementation relies upon the professionalism of educators in setting ambitious student growth and/or professional growth targets. The groups are outlined as follows:

- **Group I Educators** include anyone who instructs English Language Arts (ELA) and/or mathematics in grades 3 through 10 and is the educator-of-record for at least 10 students. These grade levels are tested by the Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS). The state test is one of their measures.

- **Group II Educators** include anyone who teaches in any grade or subject other than ELA and/or mathematics (DCAS-tested), teaches formal “courses” to those students, and for whom an approved assessment (“Measure B”) is available. Examples include science and social studies teachers.

- **Group III Educators** include anyone who does not meet the criteria for Group I or Group II educators. Examples include school nurses, psychologists, and guidance counselors.

The types and combinations of measures of student growth used for Component V are determined based upon an educator’s group classification. There are three types of measures that can be used depending upon an educator’s group:
• **Measure A** is based upon DCAS instructional scale scores for reading and/or mathematics in grades 3 through 10.\(^\text{12}\)

• **Measure B** is comprised of two types of assessment options: external and internal assessments. External assessments are recognized and identified by Delaware educator groups but generally created by outside vendors, while internal assessments were developed for and by groups of Delaware educators, coordinated by a DDOE facilitator. Both types of assessments are reviewed by an outside vendor for validity prior to approval by the state for use. An educator, with administrator approval, may choose to use either an external measure or an internal measure.

• **Measure C** “growth goals” were educator-developed, reviewed by an outside vendor and approved by the state. These growth goals are content-specific and based upon professional standards and position responsibilities. Therefore, these goals address student growth and professional growth outcomes based upon an educator’s respective field of expertise.

The measures an educator utilized and how these measures were calculated to determine final Component V ratings were based on an educator’s group and evaluator’s professional judgment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Measure B</th>
<th>Measure C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the types and weights of measures used varied by educator group, the overarching focus on student growth and the guiding principles Delaware Secretary of Education Mark Murphy emphasized in the design of Component V were consistent for all educators. As noted in his communications to all educators over the past two years these principles are:

- **Fairness**: Student growth would be a component of all educators’ evaluations, not just mathematics and reading teachers. Each educator would have the opportunity to demonstrate results against more than one measure.

- **Transparency and easy to understand**: Policies and processes would minimize complexity while ensuring as much transparency as possible for all those involved.

- **Respectful of the profession**: The system was designed to provide many opportunities for discretion and professional judgment. Therefore, in setting Component V performance

\(^{12}\) See page 16 for more information on how Measure A targets are determined.
targets, all educators were able to: 1) select their own measures from approved lists; 2) submit their own measures for approval; and 3) use additional measures if desired. Group 1 educators (mathematics and reading) also had the opportunity to vet and verify the list of students included in their final Measure A rating. Administrators had the opportunity to approve all measures and goals selected by educators in their buildings as well as any amendments to rosters for a teacher’s Measure A rating.

In the next sections we turn our focus to the impact and implementation of the DPAS-II system through a review of the distribution of educator ratings and data from the annual DPAS-II evaluation survey. The next section focuses on the four appraisal components that are based upon classroom observations and qualitative assessments of professional practice.

### How “Measure A” Student Growth Targets were originally developed

In 2010–2011, the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) began collecting data to measure student academic growth based on the DCAS. This measure (Measure A) makes up one portion of Component V of DPAS-II and is based on the change in performance of students in grades 3 through 10 on DCAS English Language Arts and/or mathematics assessments from fall to spring.

The 2013–2014 school year was the second year in which student achievement results using a growth model was fully integrated into educator evaluations. Ratings for educators who instruct students in grades 3 through 10 reading and/or mathematics are based on the percentage of their students’ instructional scores that meet individual student growth targets. In 2013–14, all students have instructional scale score growth targets, regardless of their initial performance level (i.e., rather than assigning higher-performing fall students the target of “PL4”, specific instructional scale score targets are provided).

Student growth targets were determined based on the average growth made by “similar” students over the first three years of DCAS (2010–2011 to 2012–2013). “Similar” students are defined as those who had:
- The same fall DCAS instructional score; and
- The same grade and subject; and
- The same Student With Disability (SWD), English Language Learner (ELL), SWD/ELL designation

For the 2011–2012 and 2012–13 school years, students had two opportunities in the spring to take the DCAS. The higher of the two scores was utilized in developing the student growth model. The statistical model that was used to develop expected scores (growth targets) in spring was created by pooling three years of data, i.e., combining all student records for the 2010–2011 to 2012–2013 school years and creating a regression model for each grade and subject. Using the statistical method of regression analysis, a straight line was drawn that best fits the data. The line represents the average (or statistically expected) spring scores for all students in the state. Using this line, each fall score was associated with a predicted spring growth target score. In 2013-14, separate models were created for SWDs and non-SWDs were utilized with the same methodology based upon feedback from Delaware educators.
B. DISTRIBUTION OF COMPONENT I-IV RATINGS

For the second consecutive year of the DPAS-II system, virtually all Delaware educators receiving summative evaluations earned “Satisfactory” ratings on all components observed by their evaluators.

DPAS-II Components 1-4 Distribution (2013-14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component I-IV Ratings</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent with 0 “Satisfactory” Ratings</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of with 1 “Satisfactory” Rating</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with 2 “Satisfactory” Ratings</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with 3 “Satisfactory” Ratings</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with 4 “Satisfactory” Ratings</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes 6,353 educators with Components 1-4 data entered into ERS13.

In the table above, 99 percent of Delaware educators received “Satisfactory” ratings on each of the four components based upon classroom observations and professional responsibilities. In the 2012-13 school year, 99 percent of educators also received “Satisfactory” ratings on Components I-IV. There is very little variation when looking at the four components individually as well. Only less than half of a percent of educators received an “Unsatisfactory” rating in Component I (Planning and Preparation) and Component IV (Professional Responsibilities). Only 1 percent of educators received “Unsatisfactory” ratings in Component II (Classroom Environment) and Component III (Instruction).

While student proficiency and growth rates vary widely across schools and Delaware districts, out of 210 Delaware schools with DPAS-II 2013-14 data, 193 (or 92%) had at least 95 percent of educators earning “Satisfactory” ratings on each of the four observational components. Across each of the Delaware school districts more than 95 percent of educators received “Satisfactory” ratings on Components I-IV. The distribution of Component I-IV ratings in each district varied little from the 2012-13 school year to the 2013-14 school year as seen in the chart below.

---

13 ERS is the statewide Evaluation Reporting System. Educators receive a summative evaluation every other year so these data represent those educators who are “on-cycle.”
In addition to the evaluation system’s incongruence with student outcomes within and across school districts, a performance appraisal system that results in identical ratings for over 6,000 educators provides limited value when making critical personnel decisions (professional development, coaching, promotion, compensation, retention, etc.). In a system where Teachers of the Year, recognized for their exemplary performance in the classroom, and a novice educator struggling to find his or her sea legs in the classroom receive identical ratings, questions about credibility and accuracy abound.

Evaluators assess teaching using a set of criteria under each of the four observation components along a scale of unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished. However, the options for their final rating on Components I-IV include only “Unsatisfactory” or “Satisfactory”. Thus, one educator may be “Distinguished” on each criterion within a component and another “Proficient” yet both will receive a final rating of “Satisfactory” on that component. Others see the results as an indication of evaluators’ tendency to assign higher ratings given the disincentives that accompany lower ratings (potential challenges, more paperwork, etc.). Criterion-level ratings data collected for the first time in 2013-14 have the potential to expand our understanding of the persistent lack of differentiation in evaluation ratings.

The Component I-IV ratings distribution data also do not correspond with findings about teaching effectiveness in the recently released “Delaware Educator Diagnostic: An Analysis for the First State’s Workforce.” The study included an analysis of five years of Delaware teacher and student achievement data and found that teacher impact on student achievement varies widely across the state. In some cases, the difference in student growth amounted to a difference in a year of learning.
DPAS-II Criterion-Level Ratings Distribution (2013-14)

Among a set of revisions to refine the DPAS-II regulations and system in 2013, the Delaware Department of Education proposed changes (which were approved by the Delaware State Board of Education) requiring that all educators receive ratings on each of the criteria in the DPAS-II for Teachers and Specialists rubric. These classroom observation-based criterion-level ratings provided a new, more nuanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of educators in Delaware. Criterion-level ratings present a similar picture to Component-level ratings. The overwhelming majority of educators earned “Proficient” or “Distinguished” on each of the DPAS-II criteria.

2013-14 Distribution of Educator Ratings on DPAS-II Criteria for Components I-IV (% of Educators)

The DPAS-II criteria on which the greatest number of educators received “Distinguished” ratings were Managing Classroom Procedures (22 percent) and Communicate Clearly and Accurately (20 percent). By contrast, less than 10 percent of educators received “Distinguished” ratings on Using Questioning Techniques (9 percent), Designing Student Assessments (9 percent), and Using Assessments in Instruction (6 percent). Using Questioning Techniques and Using Assessments in Instruction were also the criteria on which the greatest number of Delaware educators received “Basic” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings with 7 percent and 6 percent, respectively. While the newly-captured criterion-level ratings provide more information on teacher’s strengths and areas for growth than the DPAS-II component-level ratings, on 16 of the
18 criteria, at least 95 percent of Delaware educators received “Proficient” or “Distinguished” ratings. On 17 of the 18 summative criterion-level ratings, less than 1 percent of all teachers rated received “Unsatisfactory” ratings. Overall, if the criteria-level ratings within each Component are converted to a 1-4 scale (with a score of 4 representing a “Distinguished” rating), the statewide average for each of the Components is above 3.

*District-level distribution of DPAS-II Criterion-Level Ratings*

While the vast majority of educators in each district are rated “Proficient,” the overall distribution of criterion-level ratings varies widely across Delaware’s districts. As a case in point, on the criterion “Using Questioning Techniques” depicted in the chart below, less than 5% of educators receive “Distinguished” ratings in Sussex Tech, Colonial, and Seaford. In contrast, more than a quarter of educators in Delmar (27%) received “Distinguished” ratings and 17% were rated “Distinguished” in Lake Forest and Milford. Similarly, while 16% of educators...
received “Basic” ratings in Capital School District only 3% received “Basic” ratings in one of the state’s largest districts (Red Clay).

The district-level variation seen above can lead to a few conclusions. The variation could represent true differences in educator effectiveness across districts (i.e. educators are more skilled with “using questioning techniques” in Delmar, Lake Forest, and Milford). As criterion-level ratings are subjective appraisals of teacher performance and skills (though using a common rubric) the district variation may also represent a lack of calibration in the use of the DPAS-II rubric. Research suggests some degree of the latter is likely true and that training and certification tests for observers, regular efforts to ensure evaluators are calibrated to standards, and the use of peer or additional credentialed observers is necessary to ensure the reliability and accuracy of classroom observations.

---

Investing in School Leadership and DPAS-II: “Development Coaches”

Building the capacity of school leaders was a major strategy outlined in Delaware’s 2010 Race to the Top application. School leaders were provided with coaches to strengthen their skills as both managers and instructional leaders in their buildings. Understanding the design of the DPAS-II system was only as good as how well it was implemented in schools, the DDOE sought a vendor to provide coaching for school leaders focused on the DPAS-II process. The DDOE ultimately contracted with the Delaware Academy of School Leadership (DASL) at the University of Delaware College of Education and Human Development to provide “development coaches” for school leaders. The goal of the coaching was to increase school leaders’ proficiency with the DPAS-II process and improve the accuracy of appraisals.

In the first year of the project (SY 2011-12), nine development coaches provided almost 5,000 hours of coaching services (12 hours per month per evaluator) to 140 evaluators (principals, assistant principals and district expert evaluators) at 63 schools in all 19 districts and six charter schools in Delaware. In Year 2 of the program (2012-13) coaches worked with school leaders to move beyond compliance to a deeper level of implementation to improve instruction. Participating evaluators continued to receive DPAS-II coaching services at a “maintenance” level of six hours per month, with the exception of new principals, principals in high-need schools, and principals/assistant principals who would benefit from more extensive coaching or who requested additional coaching. These participants received 12 hours of development coach services per month. More than 50 schools signed up to receive development coach services during the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years as well.

A study of the Development Coach project was conducted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Education Laboratory and sponsored by the Institute of Education Sciences. Using descriptive and correlational analyses, the study investigated the following primary outcomes of the program: (1) quality and utility of DPAS II performance appraisals, (2) reliability and validity of performance appraisals, (3) timeliness of performance appraisals, (4) fairness of performance appraisals, (5) extent of alignment of evaluation to professional development opportunities, and (6) increased capacity for instructional leadership.

The results of the study will be made available in Fall 2014: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/project.asp?projectId=395](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/project.asp?projectId=395)

---
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Distribution of Criterion-Level Ratings among Novice Educators

On 17 of the 18 criteria, at least 90 percent of Delaware’s novice educators (those in their first three years of teaching) received “Proficient” or “Distinguished” ratings. Managing Classroom Procedures was the DPAS-II criterion on which the greatest share of novice educators received “Distinguished” ratings. By comparison, 24 percent of experienced educators (those beyond their third year of teaching) received “Distinguished” ratings on Managing Classroom Procedures.

The criteria on which the greatest numbers of novice educators were rated “Basic” were Using Questioning Techniques (12%) and Engaging Students in Learning (9%). On 17 of the 18 summative criterion-level ratings, less than 1 percent of all novice educators rated received “Unsatisfactory” ratings. On average, novice educators scored slightly lower than experienced educators on each of the DPAS-II components.

The district-level variation in criteria-level ratings is more pronounced for novice educators. Using the criterion “Managing Student Behavior” as an example, while novice educators are most likely to be rated “Proficient” in every district, “Distinguished” or “Basic/Unsatisfactory” ratings were given at different rates across districts. Less than 5 percent of novice educators were rated “Distinguished” on Managing Student Behavior in Colonial, Christina, and Smyrna. In Caesar Rodney (20 percent) and Woodbridge (27 percent) at least 20 percent of novice educators were rated “Distinguished.” Likewise, three districts had no novice educators rated “Basic” or “Unsatisfactory” on the criterion “Managing Student Behavior” and in Capital and Seaford 20 percent and 29 percent received those ratings, respectively. The DPAS-II system complements these observation-based measures of performance with measures of teaching effectiveness related to student improvement (Component V). The next section focuses on the data collected from the state’s second year of implementation of a student growth measure through Component V.
C. DISTRIBUTION OF “COMPONENT V” RATINGS

The revised Component V (Student Improvement) was implemented statewide for the first time in the 2012-13 school year. Every Delaware educator and administrator received a Component V rating based upon evidence of student growth and state code requires that educators and administrators receive Component V ratings annually. The system was designed such that all educators had multiple measures of student growth. Thus, some combination of Measure A, Measure B or Measure C options were used to determine an educator’s Component V score. Below we present and compare the distribution of ratings within each of these student growth measures.

**Measure A Educator Ratings Distribution**

For the third consecutive year every “educator of record” (for at least 10 students in reading and/or mathematics in grades 3 through 10) received a “Measure A” rating based on the statewide DCAS exam as one of his or her measures of student growth. “Measure A” ratings were determined based upon the percent of an educator’s students that met their individualized growth targets in reading and/or math. These targets were projections of expected growth based upon three years of data on similar students and a student’s score on the fall administration of the DCAS state assessment. In 2013-14, a few changes were made to the statistical model used to determine expected growth targets that have implications for the final distribution of ratings. One of these changes involved giving expected growth targets to all students—including students whose fall DCAS scores placed them at the highest proficiency Performance Level (PL-4). During the 2012-13 school year, students who scored at PL-4 in the fall had to score at PL-4 in the Spring to be considered as having met their growth target. Without an actual predicted growth target, among students scoring PL-4 in the fall in DCAS Math, 98% met their target. In contrast, in 2013-14 around half of PL-4 students met their growth target (comparable to the results of other performance levels). This change also had implications for Measure A as teachers of PL-4 students were also expected to demonstrate student growth.

---

16 Even when an educator is in an “off-year” in their summative evaluation cycle, Component V ratings are still required.

17 Measure A ratings provided in the 2011-12 school year were “for information only” as this was the pilot year.
Similar to the 2012-13 school year, every Group 1 educator knew each of his or her students’ targets at the beginning of the 2013-14 school year. All Group 1 educators were also able to use the state’s online Roster Verification System (RVS) in Spring 2014 to confirm their students, with administrator approval, and their role as the “educator of record” for any student who they did/did not instruct for at least 85% of the course. After rosters were fully-verified, Group 1 educator ratings were determined using the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (discretion)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65% or more of a teacher’s students meet their DCAS student growth targets.</td>
<td>50-64% of a teacher’s students meet their DCAS student growth targets.</td>
<td>35-49% of a teacher’s students meet their DCAS student growth targets. Administrator has discretion to upgrade to a “Satisfactory” rating.</td>
<td>Less than 35% of a teacher’s students meet their DCAS student growth targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 3,458 educators were classified as Group 1 and the distribution of Measure A ratings was as follows:

![Distribution of Component V Measure A Ratings by School Year](image)

One third of Group 1 teachers (32 percent) were rated “Exceeds” in 2013-14 as compared to 54 percent in 2012-13. This substantial decrease is due in part to giving all students expected growth targets and thus removing artificially high rates of meeting growth targets for PL-4 students. The most common rating for Group 1 teachers in 2013-14 was “Satisfactory” with 39% of teachers receiving this rating. 29% of teachers received ratings of “Unsatisfactory with Administrator discretion” or “Unsatisfactory” as compared to 17% in 2012-13.
The distribution of Measure A ratings varied widely across the 19 Delaware school districts. The share of Group 1 educators rated “Exceeds” ranged from 79 percent in Sussex Tech to 9 percent in Seaford. In 18 out of 19 school districts, the majority of Group 1 educators received either “Satisfactory” or “Exceeds” ratings on Measure A. 4 districts had at least 50 percent of their Group 1 educators receive “Exceeds” ratings on their Measure A.

The percentage of Group 1 educators receiving “Satisfactory” ratings was even higher when administrator decisions—including the ability to upgrade a teacher’s “Unsatisfactory” rating—were considered. In cases in which only 35 percent to 49 percent of a teacher’s students met their growth targets, administrators had the option to upgrade “Unsatisfactory” Measure A ratings to “Satisfactory.” Across the state, 72 percent of educators whose Measure A rating was initially “Unsatisfactory with administrator discretion” were upgraded to “Satisfactory” ratings by their evaluators. This is up from last year when Measure A ratings were upgraded in 56 percent of cases. After accounting for administrator discretion, 32 percent of Group 1 teachers received an “Exceeds” rating, 55 percent a “Satisfactory” rating, and 13 percent an “Unsatisfactory” rating.

The share of educators whose ratings were upgraded to “Satisfactory” varied across districts. In some districts less than a third of educators rated “Unsatisfactory with administrator discretion” were upgraded to “Satisfactory” ratings. However, in other districts administrator discretion to upgrade a teacher’s rating was used in more than two-thirds of the cases. In four districts, teachers were upgraded to “Satisfactory” at least 85 percent of the time. For Group 1 educators, however, Measure A ratings formed only one of the student growth measures that would factor into their final Component V rating.
Measure B and C Ratings Distribution

All Group 1 and 2 educators received Measure B ratings as a portion of their Component V rating. Group II educators teach grades and/or subjects not covered by the DCAS reading or math exam. Unlike the Measure A ratings, comprised of targets set for students taking the DCAS exam, an educator’s Measure B can include either external or internal assessments administered to the educator’s students. External assessments are recognized and identified by Delaware educator groups but generally created by outside vendors, while internal assessments were developed for and by groups of Delaware educators. An educator, with administrator approval, may choose to use either an external measure or an internal measure. Whereas Measure A included predefined targets, Measure B targets are set by an educator along with their school leader after administering a pre-assessment to students in the fall of the school year. A Measure B post-assessment is administered later in the school year and an educator receives an “Unsatisfactory,” “Satisfactory” or “Exceeds” rating based upon whether students met the growth targets agreed upon by an educator and school leader in the fall. Likewise, Measure C “growth goals” are set by an educator and approved by a school leader at the beginning of the school year with ratings determined based upon which goals are met by the end of the year. The key difference is that Measure C includes content-specific growth goals based upon professional standards rather than an assessment.

Measure B ratings were entered into ERS for 7,599 Group 1 and 2 educators statewide. Measure C ratings were entered for 7,283 Group 2 and Group 3 educators. The distribution of ratings was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-2014 Component V Measures and Overall Rating Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A (n=2816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B (n=7599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure C (n=7283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (n=10,596)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure C had the greatest share of teachers rated “Exceeds” (72 percent) and around two-thirds of Group 1 and 2 educators (65%) received “Exceeds” ratings on their Measure B. While 13 percent of educators received “Unsatisfactory” ratings on Measure A, 6 percent and 1 percent
received “Unsatisfactory” ratings on Measure B and C, respectively.

![Distribution of 2013-14 Component V Measure B Ratings by District]

Similar to Measure A ratings, the share of educators receiving “Exceeds” ratings on Measure B differed across Delaware districts. While in Smyrna School District, 95 percent of Group 1 and 2 educators received an “Exceeds” rating on Measure B, 44 percent of educators in Sussex Tech School District received the same rating. In five districts, one in ten educators received “Unsatisfactory” ratings in Measure B while in three school districts only 1 percent received “Unsatisfactory” ratings.

### Submitting Alternative Educator-Developed “Measure B” Assessments

Recognizing there are many high-quality student assessments educators and districts have developed and are using in their classrooms, the DDOE invited districts to submit these assessments to be used as approved Component V Measure B assessments. The TLEU first shared this opportunity in mid-November 2013. Districts and LEAs could submit proposals to use alternate Measure B assessments. These assessments could be internally developed by the district/LEA, or the district/LEA could submit an externally developed and produced exam.

The DDOE partnered with Research In Action (RIA) to provide the process, materials, and training for the creation and management of alternate measures. The TLEU continues to be available to deploy technical assistance, and has budgeted resources to review at least 100 submissions. The first alternative assessments for 2014-2015 were submitted in the spring of 2014 and the window for submissions continued until July 2014.
Similar to the 2012-13 school year, an educator’s Measure A and B were both used to evaluate student growth. However, the ratings a Group 1 educator received on the two measures did not necessarily correspond. When an educator received an “Exceeds” rating on Measure A they also received an “Exceeds” rating on Measure B 78 percent of the time. However, the majority (57 percent) of Group 1 educators who received a “Satisfactory” rating on Measure A also received an “Exceeds” rating on their Measure B. Likewise, 61 percent (up from 50 percent in 2012-13) of the educators rated “Unsatisfactory” on Measure A were rated “Exceeds” on Measure B and 31 percent were rated “Satisfactory.”

Measure B and C ratings were also not particularly well-aligned. 87 percent of educators who received an “Exceeds” rating on Measure B also were rated “Exceeds” on Measure C. Half of educators rated “Satisfactory” on Measure B received the same rating on their Measure C. Conversely, 70 percent of educators rated “Unsatisfactory” in Measure B received an “Exceeds” rating on Measure C.
In cases where a Group 1 or 2 educator was rated differently on their two measures (A/B or B/C), the DDOE provided guidance for what an educator’s overall Component V rating would be. If an educator received a combination of “Exceeds” and “Satisfactory” the final Component V rating would be “Satisfactory.” For a combination of “Exceeds” and “Unsatisfactory” ratings the final Component V rating would be “Satisfactory.” Finally, where the combination of ratings was “Satisfactory” and “Unsatisfactory,” an administrator had the discretion to upgrade to a “Satisfactory” rating. In 85 percent of these instances administrators opted to upgrade an educator’s rating to “Satisfactory.” In 2012-13 administrators upgraded ratings to “Satisfactory” in 87 percent of cases.

After administrator discretion was taken into consideration and Measure A, B, or C ratings were combined (for the more than 10,000 educators with Component V ratings) more than half (51 percent) received “Exceeds” ratings, 48 percent were rated “Satisfactory,” and 1 percent were rated “Unsatisfactory.” This distribution closely resembled the distribution of ratings during the first year of statewide implementation of the revised Component V (2013-13). These Component V ratings also mirrored Component I-IV ratings discussed earlier in that 99 percent of educators received the highest categories of ratings and only 1 percent were rated “Unsatisfactory.” When Component V ratings were compared for educators who also received Components I-IV ratings in 2013-14, the relationship between the classroom observation-based components and the student growth component was weak. 99 percent of educators rated “Exceeds” on Component V received 4 out of 4 “Satisfactory” ratings in Component I-IV. However, 98 percent of educators rated “Satisfactory” on Component V had the same ratings. While educators rated “Unsatisfactory” on Component V were significantly more likely to receive at least one “Unsatisfactory” rating in Components I-IV (16 percent received at least one “Unsatisfactory” rating), 84 percent of these educators received all “Satisfactory” ratings based upon classroom observations. This data point led the News Journal to call the system a “farce.”

D. 2013-2014 OVERALL (SUMMATIVE) RATINGS

For all educators “on-cycle” in a given school year, Component V ratings and Components I-IV ratings are eventually combined using a rubric provided by the Delaware Department of Education to form those educators’ summative ratings. Unlike the formative feedback an educator receives at various junctures of the year—designed to identify strengths and weaknesses and avenues for professional growth—the summative rating is designed as an indicator of the educator’s effectiveness in his or her role. Whereas a formative appraisal is used by an evaluator to monitor and coach an educator’s professional growth, the summative appraisal is an evaluation that can be used to make personnel decisions (i.e. compensation, promotion, student assignments, dismissal, etc.). For example, in Delaware two consecutive “ineffective” summative ratings are used to establish a “pattern of ineffective teaching” which is grounds for dismissal proceedings. This does not suggest that summative ratings cannot be used formatively. Both educators and school leaders can use these ratings to guide their actions in future school years. However, the stakes are necessarily high with summative evaluations as the decisions have clear implications for the educators, students, and schools.

In 2013-14 5,897 educators received summative evaluations in Delaware. Of these educators, half (48 percent) received “Highly-Effective” ratings and 51 percent received a rating of “Effective.” In 2012-13, 51 percent of educators were rated “Highly-effective” and 48 percent rated “Effective.” Only 1% of educators received a rating of “Needs Improvement” in 2013-14 as in 2012-13.

In each of the DPAS-II educator groups, nearly 100 percent of educators were rated “Highly-Effective” or higher. Of the three educator groups, Group 3 educators were the most likely to receive “Highly-Effective” ratings followed by Group 2 educators. Nearly two-thirds of Group 3 educators (65 percent) were rated “Highly-effective” as compared to only 53 percent of Group 2 educators and 27 percent of Group 1 educators. Group 3 educators were most likely to be rated “Highly-Effective” during the 2012-13 school year as well.
This pattern—where Group 1 educators were least likely to receive “Highly-Effective” summative ratings and Group 3 educators were most likely—was consistent across nearly all Delaware school districts. However, in some districts Group 3 educators were substantially more likely to be rated “Highly-Effective” than Group 1 educators\(^\text{19}\). In Brandywine School District, 81 percent of Group 3 educators were rated “Highly-Effective” as compared to only 17% of Group 1 educators (a 64 point difference). Seaford, Milford, and Woodbridge school districts also had differences greater than 50 percentage points for Group 1 versus Group 3 educators rated “Highly-Effective.” By contrast, in Cape Henlopen and NCC Vo-Tech there was much less of a disparity across the educator groups with 20 and 24 percentage point differences between Group 3 and Group 1 educators, respectively.

These patterns likely reflect the fact that while DPAS-II improvements strengthened the focus on student growth for all educators across the system, many of the student growth goals set by educators and their evaluators were less rigorous than predicted DCAS growth targets for Group 1 educators (see page 28 for an example of Measure B and C goals). This was evident in the earlier comparison of Group 1 educators’ Measure A and B ratings. 61 percent of the educators with less than 35% of their students meeting DCAS growth targets (“Unsatisfactory” on Measure A) were rated “Exceeds” on their Measure B assessment ratings (where educators collaboratively set targets and evaluators assess the results). Overall, at the summative rating level, DPAS-II continues to present a more optimistic picture of educator effectiveness than the data available on the proficiency and college-readiness of Delaware students. In the next section we consider the feedback educators provided during the year on the DPAS-II system.

\(^{19}\) The chart above suppresses data for any district or group with less than 10 educators in a given cell. Districts without a bar for a particular group did not have sufficient sample size in that cell.
A Tale of Three Component V Goals

The validity of Component V as a measure of educator effectiveness is dependent upon educators’ ability to set rigorous and student-centered goals in collaboration with their evaluator. The following goals are examples collected during DDOE monitoring visits and demonstrate the varying rigor of goals used in 2013-14 for Component V and the need for improvements in the goal-setting process.

Example 1

**Measure B Goal:** Students who did not meet target score will go up by 5%

**Baseline:** 17 of 19 did not make target of 190

**Satisfactory Target:** Students who did not make target of 190 will go up by 5% on Math MAP

**Exceeds Target:** Students who did not make target of 190 will go up by 10% on Math MAP

*Analysis:* This Measure B goal is clear, but only to a certain point. The baseline data outlines the criteria to reach the MAP target score (190) and the number of students who did not reach it (17 out of 19). However, the Satisfactory Target of “will go up by 5%” is less clear. Do these students not need to reach the target? Is this an appropriate indicator of educator effectiveness that is linked to the school/district’s aspirations for its students?

Example 2

**Measure C Goal:** DIBELS

**Baseline:** 15 out 15 did not meet target of 87 words read correctly in 1 minute

**Satisfactory Target:** 80% of group will show improvement

**Exceeds Target:** 85% of group will show improvement

*Analysis:* The Measure C targets outlined above are definitively unclear, and create a context where it will be difficult to determine a final performance rating. What does “show improvement” mean? Would the teacher meet her satisfactory target if 80% of the kids improve by one point (one word) and none meet the target of 87 words?

Example 3

**Measure B Goal:** DIBELS

**Baseline:** Included % with number of students

**Satisfactory Target:** 83% of students will achieve a composite score of Benchmark (core) on the DIBELS assessment (20 out of 24 students)

**Exceeds Target:** 91% of students will achieve a composite score of Benchmark on DIBELS assessment

*Analysis:* This example shows a more targeted approach that provides clear numbers and percentages that may represent a more accurate picture of student achievement/teacher effectiveness.
E. IMPROVING DPAS-II: INCORPORATING FEEDBACK FROM EDUCATORS

In order for the DPAS-II system to be one in which performance matters, the data presented in the previous sections demonstrates the continued need for system and implementation refinements. Since the DPAS-II system’s inception in the 1980s educators, school leaders, and other key stakeholders have played a role in making it responsive to the current needs of the educator workforce. The 2013-14 school year was not different. There were a number of opportunities for educators, school leaders, district leaders, and other stakeholders to shape the design and implementation of the DPAS:

- **DPAS-II Review and Advisory Committees**: The Department of Education is required in state code to convene a DPAS-II Advisory Committee which meets quarterly to review DPAS-II data, review proposed regulations, and any proposed amendments concerning educator evaluation in the state’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waiver. State code requires the committee has representation from teachers, administrators, superintendents, parents, higher education administrators, school board members, the Governor’s Office and chairs of the Delaware House and Senate education committees. Delaware regulation also requires the state to organize a committee for the purpose of developing and revising the DPAS-II guides and considering additional changes to the system. This committee is comprised of DSEA, DASA, superintendents, principals, district leaders, teachers, and representatives from higher education. The committee advises the DDOE on matters related to the DPAS-II evaluation system and over the past three years has made recommendations related to (but not limited to) regulatory changes, DPAS-II guide revisions, DPAS-II implementation, and training/professional development.

- **Delaware Principals Advisory Group (D-PAG)**: All principals and assistant principals were invited to join the monthly meetings of the D-PAG to advise the department on the DPAS-II system and other matters pertaining to teacher and leader effectiveness.

- **Delaware Technical Advisory Group (DE-TAG)**: The Delaware Technical Advisory Group (DE-TAG) met throughout the 2013-14 school year and is comprised of national experts with knowledge and skill in assessment development, accountability, and teacher evaluation systems for the purposes of supporting the State with the ongoing development and refinement of DPAS-II and Component V.

- **Mid-Year Conversations with Secretary Murphy**: All educators were invited to participate in “mid-year conversations” with Secretary Murphy and leaders of the DDOE to reflect on the DPAS-II system during a meeting held in each county.
• **Ongoing meetings with DSEA and DASA:** Secretary Murphy’s monthly meetings with Chief School Officers and their district leadership teams; quarterly meetings with district personnel directors were also regularly used to collect feedback about the DPAS-II system.

In addition to these opportunities, the annual DPAS-II process evaluation study provided one of the most wide-reaching efforts to collect feedback from Delaware educators and school leaders on the DPAS-II system. The annual process evaluation has been conducted by an external vendor (Progress Education Corporation) for the last seven years and includes a survey, focus groups, and interviews. In April and May of 2014, 47 percent of teachers, 45 percent of specialists and 53 percent of administrators responded to the survey. The survey included questions with fixed responses such as agree or disagree, as well as questions with open-ended responses which allowed respondents to clarify their points of view and include additional detail. Across the state, 40 interviews (30 minutes in length) with educators and administrators. The study also included six focus groups covering all three Delaware counties. The full report is available online\(^{20}\). In this report we provide select findings from the study and identify strengths and areas of improvement for the DPAS-II system.

**Educators and administrators recognize the impact of improvements to the DPAS-II system:** In response to educator feedback over the past 5 years, the Delaware State Board of Education passed amendments to Regulations 106A/107A which took effect in July 2013. These amendments allowed for more flexibility in the use of announced versus unannounced observations; required criterion-level ratings to be provided to educators and entered into the state’s evaluation reporting system, and they also allowed Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to credential educators’ peers to serve as classroom observers. The survey revealed that educators and administrators viewed these changes as positive for the DPAS-II system. 66 percent of teachers believe the increased flexibility with unannounced observation has saved time and 61 percent believe that it has improved feedback opportunities. 72 percent of administrators believe that the requirement to give criterion-level ratings in 2013-14 allowed for meaningful conversations about growth. Nearly two-thirds of administrators believe that the addition of credentialed observers has been valuable to the process.

**Educators and administrators view the DPAS-II system as impactful for student achievement and improving teaching:** 61 percent of teachers and 67 percent of administrators thought that the DPAS-II system was one of the top five drivers of student achievement gains. Across the state, 53 percent of teachers felt that the DPAS-II system had some or a major impact on improving their teaching. This ranged from a low of 38 percent to a high of 65 percent across the districts. This rate was higher among administrators, with 64 percent of them reporting that the system has some or a major impact on improving practice. Teachers were also asked about the level of impact that each specific component of the

\(^{20}\) Link to full report: [http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/DPAS_II_Evaluation_20132014.pdf](http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/DPAS_II_Evaluation_20132014.pdf)
evaluation system had on improving their teaching. The components listed in the order of the share of teachers who stated that each component had “some” or “major” impact on improving their teaching were as follows: the Instruction component (68 percent), the Planning and Preparation Component (64 percent), the Classroom Environment component (61 percent), the Student Improvement component (56 percent), and the Professional Responsibilities component (50 percent). 72 percent of teachers, 64 percent of specialists, and 77 percent of administrators found the feedback they received through the formal DPAS-II process to be useful.

Overall, educators and administrators want DPAS-II to change: Only 28 percent of teachers, 23 percent of specialists, and 22 percent of administrators think that the system should be “continued in its current form.” 63 percent of teachers gave the DPAS-II system a passing grade (C or better) but the most common grade received was a C (given by 38% of teachers) for the second consecutive year. The most common grade among specialists and administrators was also a C. There was also a difference in the share of teachers who gave the system an A or B rating by whether the teacher was a novice teacher or a more experienced teacher. 38 percent of novice teachers across the state gave the system either an A or B rating compared with 23 percent of more experienced teachers.

Teachers are split on the fairness of the DPAS-II system: Slightly less than half of the teacher respondents (48 percent) thought the system was “fair and equitable.” A higher proportion of administrators than teachers thought the system was fair with 62 percent of administrators responding positively to this item. Among teachers who thought the DPAS-II system was fair, 49 percent graded the system as an A or B. In contrast, only 4 percent of teachers who thought the system was not fair gave it an A or B.

Quality of district and school DPAS-II implementation matters for fairness: Teachers who felt that the evaluation process was implemented appropriately at the district level were

"Good administrators are the driving force behind effective implementation of DPAS II and ultimately effective results. When implemented properly and with the intention of admonition and improvement where necessary and praise and incentive when appropriate, the system can work in a very effective fashion. I have been privileged to have all of the above and that has provided me with the opportunity to grow as a teacher in a safe and encouraging environment that ultimately benefits everyone - starting with our students. Again, appropriate administration of DPAS, necessary and appropriate training, and intentionally appropriate implementation can have multiple positive effects." – Quote from DPAS-II 2014 Survey
more likely to think the system was fair and equitable. 60 percent of teachers who felt that the evaluation system was implemented appropriately at the district level thought the system was fair and equitable, while 81 percent of teachers who felt the evaluation system was not implemented appropriately at the district level thought the system was not fair and equitable. Similar findings were seen for implementation at the school level. Of teachers who thought implementation was “appropriate”, 55 percent agreed that the system was fair, compared with 19 percent of teachers who thought implementation was not appropriate at their location.

**Potential Opportunities for Improvement**

**Increased educator involvement and engagement in system improvements:** While 42 percent of administrators believe administrators were adequately involved in improving the DPAS-II system, only 31 percent of teachers felt that teachers had been adequately involved. 19 percent of teachers, 25 percent of specialists, and 32 percent of administrators reported that they were personally “able to contribute to changes in the DPAS-II system.” 53 percent of teachers who thought that educators were adequately involved gave the system an A or B compared with 14 percent of teachers who disagreed that educators were adequately involved.

**Increased training for administrators and educators:** While 79 percent of administrators felt DPAS-II training is adequate, only 60 percent of teachers and 50% of specialists felt training in the evaluation system is adequate. When asked about the adequacy of training at the district-level the rates of agreement varied across districts from 83 percent in Woodbridge to 44 percent in Brandywine School District. Most prevalent was a request for additional training 49 percent of teachers and 45 percent of administrators reported needing additional training in the area of goal setting. Many teachers expanded upon this concern in the open-ended questions of the survey, also listing concerns about goal setting particularly for special needs populations. Teachers wanted guidance so that they could be sure that they were setting rigorous goals for their students.

**Increased differentiation in system:** Teachers by and large thought that there should be some differentiation throughout the DPAS-II evaluation system. 67 percent of teachers think the evaluation process should be differentiated based on an educator’s years of experience, and 86
percent think that it should be differentiated based on an educator’s role. Other types of differentiation that were mentioned include the subject taught, the grade level taught, and the effectiveness of a teacher.

Continue to simplify and streamline the process: There is a desire on the part of teachers for the system to be simpler to allow more opportunity for meaningful feedback and potential for improving their practice. Work in this regard began last year with the use of Bloomboard and changes to regulations 106A/107A. However, many teachers still stated that they needed training in simply filling out the required forms, highlighting the need to continue to make improvements in this area.

“I have a very strong supportive 6th grade team. It is from them that I have been able to survive this first year. The various sites, computer downloads required by tech, and the numerous passwords have been an adjustment. I like the online evaluation but it is only through asking my peers several questions and often asking them to show me more than once what to do that I have been able to keep up.”

State Monitoring of LEA DPAS-II Implementation

Delaware state regulations require the DDOE to engage in ongoing monitoring of DPAS-II implementation at the local level. As the DPAS-II system underwent significant revisions over the last two years the DDOE increased its supports (Development Coaches, trainings, DPAS-II hotline, etc.) for district and school staff while also expanding its monitoring efforts. The Department’s Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Unit led the cross-departmental teams visiting Delaware districts and schools to assess the fidelity of the DPAS-II process and the quality of documentation. Overall the DDOE conducted monitoring visits in 75 schools over the last two years. The state’s monitoring activities included:

1. A review of data completion and quality through the state’s Evaluation Reporting System (ERS)
2. A review of quality of documentation and overall implementation of the DPAS-II process.

In order to monitor data completion and quality, the DDOE reviewed reports generated monthly and shared (through ERS) with districts to capture evaluators’ progress with the evaluation process at various points of the school year. The DDOE also reviewed ERS to identify schools where required data were not entered into the system or were entered with errors (e.g. evaluation ratings did not match the DPAS-II rubric). The DDOE followed up with schools and districts with missing data or reporting errors.

Quality of documentation and overall implementation of the DPAS-II process was monitored through onsite visits to districts and schools to assess processes, procedures, and forms. Formative feedback documentation as well as Component V documentation was also reviewed during the visits to schools and districts. Schools and districts received feedback/ratings indicating the degree to which they were on-track with implementation.
F. IMPROVING DPAS-II: 2014-15 & BEYOND

This report demonstrates the need for continuing improvement of the evaluation system and, perhaps most importantly, building capacity in Delaware’s schools and districts to implement the system well. Although the system provides some meaningful data about which educators are excelling and which educators are struggling to help their students grow, that data is not translating into meaningfully differentiated results in Delaware’s overall rating system. Educators have expressed their views about how the system can be improved through advisory committees, town-hall meetings, focus groups, and surveys. In response to all of these observations and suggestions—from state, district, and school leaders and educators across Delaware—the DDOE has taken the following actions to improve the system in the 2014-15 school year:

- **Continuation of Development Coaches:** Nearly 55 schools signed up to use a Development Coach to assist with educator evaluation this year. Each school receives coaching every week focused on helping school leaders: improve their observations of teachers, strengthen the process through which they set expectations for their educators, and identify opportunities for teacher and student improvement.

- **Trainings for Administrators:** Summer Base Camp provided a review of general DPAS-II processes with a focus on regulatory changes including the role of Smarter Balanced and Measure A in the 2014-2015 school year, the incorporation of Short Observations, the use of the Component 1 Form, and how Novice/Experienced educator status relates to rubric ratings (a Basic rating is no longer considered Satisfactory for a Novice Teacher) and Patterns of Ineffective Teaching (Needs Improvement is no longer considered satisfactory performance for Novice Teachers). A deep-dive into goal setting, rubric ratings, and discussion of video observation was also provided.

- **Credentialing Assessment:** The implementation of the credentialing assessment plays multiple roles in improving our state-wide evaluation system including skill development, assessing DDOE training, and developing ongoing professional training in addition to the role it plays in formal credentialing. 444 school leaders participated in the credentialing assessment as part of Summer Base Camp in 2014. The credentialing assessment was comprised of questions focusing on video observation, goal setting, regulatory changes, general processes and system application using case study scenarios.

- **More Flexibility in Classroom Observations:** The Delaware State Board of Education passed amendments to Regulations 106A/107A, which took effect in July 2013. The amendments allow for more flexibility in the use of announced versus unannounced observations. The revised regulations also allow State or Local Education Agencies (SEAs or LEAs) to credential educators’ peers to serve as classroom observers.
• **Strengthening Alternative Assessments**: Recognizing that a significant portion of educators are evaluated using Measure B assessments, DOE has refined existing assessments, and invited districts and schools to submit their best assessments for state approval. The DDOE will keep the window open for the submission of assessments to be used in the 2015-16 school year.

• **Alternative Educator Evaluation System Application**: Recognizing that each district and school brings its own unique strengths to the development of an educator evaluation process, the DDOE has developed a process by which LEAs can create their own educator evaluation system in an effort to increase educator support and accountability and, most importantly, student achievement. The Teaching Excellence Framework (used in four charter schools) is the first approved alternative evaluation system and the results of the first year of this system are provided as an addendum to this report.

These efforts are based upon feedback from stakeholders and lessons learned from previous years. The efforts are designed to improve the system in a manner that leads to learning and professional growth for all educators and leaders in Delaware schools, resulting in better educational outcomes for students. Delaware has invested heavily in this system because it is essential to be able to identify the best educators, and those who are struggling to serve our students, so that decision-makers can replicate best practices and support those who need extra help.

---

**Summary of DPAS-II Regulation Changes in 2014**

Regulations 106A/107A now provide evaluators flexibility in their appraisal of Component One, thus ensuring that every educator has the opportunity to provide materials and evidence on their planning/preparation:

- The “Pre-Observation” form shall be changed to the “Observation Form” in Regulation and in the Guide

Regulations 106A/107A will provide districts/charters the opportunity to strengthen Component IV:

- LEAs may substitute the entirety of Component Four with a collaboratively developed Component. An LEA would decide and announce LEA-wide no later than 7/31 of a given year of implementation.

Regulation 106A allows for “Shorts” (10-minutes) above the minimum observations required:

- “Shorts” will focus on Components II & III only, and cannot include the use of the Observation Form; “Shorts” must be followed by a brief conference within 10 days of the observation; One “Short” alone cannot lead to a mid-year Improvement Plan—evidence should be from multiple sources; “Shorts” shall not be conducted until at least one full observation (no less than 30 minutes) has occurred

Regulations 106A/107A (and Guides) will clarify performance expectations for Delaware educators:

- A summative rating of “Needs Improvement” shall not be considered a “Satisfactory” year
- The Guide will not distinguish between Novice/Experienced as it pertains to performance on the rubric
G. CLOSER LOOK: CHARTER SCHOOL DPAS-II EVALUATION DISTRIBUTION

Evaluation data were available for 552 educators in 19 charter schools in 2013-14. Of these 552 educators, 453 received a summative rating during the 2013-14 school year. The distribution of summative ratings was as follows:

44 percent of educators receiving summative evaluations in charter schools were rated “Highly Effective” up from 32 percent last year. This compares with 49 percent of educators receiving this rating in the most recent school year in traditional public schools. 97 percent of educators in Delaware charter schools received a rating of “Effective” or better, which is very similar to the 99 percent of educators receiving the top two ratings in Delaware’s traditional public schools.

The distribution of overall Component V ratings varied between charter schools and traditional public schools. While 51 percent of educators in traditional public schools received an “Exceeds” rating, 39 percent of charter school educators received an “Exceeds” rating. Overall 97 percent of educators in charter schools received a Component V rating of “Satisfactory” or better.

Teaching Excellence Framework

In June of 2013, four charter schools—Prestige Academy, EastSide Charter School, Thomas A. Edison Charter School, and Kuumba Academy Charter School—submitted a collective application in response to the Alternative Educator Evaluation Application offered by the Delaware Department of Education. The Teaching Excellence Framework was implemented by these four schools, collectively referred to in this document as the “Charter Collaborative”, in the 2013-2014 school year.

The Teaching Excellence Framework shares some similarities with the DPAS-II evaluation system. Specifically, the Teaching Excellence Framework maintains the same five components as
the DPAS-II: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Assessment, Professional Responsibilities, and Student Achievement. The Teaching Excellence Framework also gives teachers a summative rating that is the same as DPAS II – either “Highly-Effective”, “Effective”, “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory”. However, there are a number of features that distinguish the Teaching Excellence Framework from the DPAS-II. In the Teaching Excellence Framework, each teacher receives a minimum of 8 unannounced observations per year. In DPAS-II, not all teachers are evaluated annually, and the requirement is for three observations per year for novice teachers and one observation for experienced teachers. The Teaching Excellence Framework also only uses unannounced observations. In addition, there are more specific ratings for each of Components I-IV with evaluators utilizing 5 levels of effectiveness instead of the satisfactory/unsatisfactory binary utilized within the DPAS-II system. The rubric has also been revised to include more specific language regarding each of the rating categories.

One of the emphases of the schools in their bid to use this alternative evaluation system is to provide teachers with a more rigorous process. The chart below provides some evidence that this may be taking place. Ratings within each of the four components for the schools using this alternative evaluation system are for the most part lower than the average ratings of teachers in other charter schools as well as in non-charter schools.
School Comparison: Teaching Excellence Framework Schools and new “Priority Schools”

The Delaware Department of Education recently (September 2014) named six “Priority Schools.” To be identified as a “Priority School” a school must have performance in the lowest 5% of Title I schools in the state in ELA/Math, with little or no progress in the last few years. The six Priority Schools identified this year are all located in the city of Wilmington. They primarily serve low-income student populations. Because of the similarity of their student populations with those of the schools in the Charter Collaborative, comparisons between these schools particularly around the effectiveness of teachers can be instructive.

While DCAS proficiency rates ranged from 28% to 41% in Math and 29% to 46% in ELA in 2013-2014, 96 percent of teachers in the Priority Schools were rated “Effective” or “Highly-Effective.” This is in contrast with the schools in the Charter Collaborative whose student proficiency rates were significantly higher, yet which at 89 percent had a lower portion of their teachers rated “Effective” or “Highly-Effective”. In addition, the distributions of both Measure A and the overall Component V are quite different for schools in the Charter Collaborative and the schools identified as Priority Schools. The schools in the Charter Collaborative had 82 percent of their teachers rated Satisfactory or above on Measure A and 90 percent rated Satisfactory or above on the overall Component V. In contrast, the Priority Schools had only 40 percent of teachers rated Satisfactory or above on Measure A, yet 96 percent of teachers in Priority Schools were rated Satisfactory or Exceeds on the overall Component V.