



STATE OF ALABAMA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Joseph B. Morton
 State Superintendent
 of Education

Alabama
 State Board
 of Education

February 18, 2005


Governor Bob Riley
 President

MEMORANDUM

Randy McKinney
 District I

TO: County and City Superintendents

Betty Peters
 District II

FROM: Joseph B. Morton 
 State Superintendent of Education

Stephanie W. Bell
 District III

RE: Evaluation of Contract Principals

Dr. Ethel H. Hall
 District IV
 Vice President
 Emerita

Thank you for your continued support of the Professional Education Personnel Evaluation (PEPE) program. Please find enclosed the *PEPE Principal Evaluation Supplemental Procedures* and supplemental Q and A documents that pertain to the annual evaluation of *contract* principals. A second dissemination of these documents is due to the recent increased number of newly appointed or elected superintendents.

Ella B. Bell
 District V

Although all contract principals must be evaluated annually, the annual evaluations are not always required to be **full** evaluations, which use all evaluation data collection instruments. Alternatives to annual, **full** evaluations of contract principals serving a three-year contract have been developed and are presented in the enclosure.

David F. Byers, Jr.
 District VI

All **probationary** contract principals should undergo **full** evaluations annually using all PEPE data collection instruments based on State Board of Education policy.

Sandra Ray
 District VII
 President Pro Tem
 and Presiding Officer

Please direct questions or concerns about the content of this communication to Dr. Barbara Walters, PEPE Section Coordinator, at (334) 242-9962.

Dr. Mary Jane Caylor
 District VIII

JBM/BBW/NJT

Joseph B. Morton
 Secretary and
 Executive Officer

Enclosures

cc: PEPE Coordinators

FY05-2123

**PEPE Principal Evaluation Supplemental Procedures
Evaluation of Contract Principals**

All contract principals must be evaluated annually. These evaluations are not always required to be **full** evaluations, i.e., evaluations that focus on all knowledge/skill areas using **all** evaluation instruments. A contract principal who receives a satisfactory performance composite score (score of 36 or higher) in his/her **full** evaluation year may, with agreement of the superintendent and local board approval, implement his/her annually developed Professional Development Plan (PDP) as his/her full evaluation process in the two years following the evaluation year in which all evaluation instruments were used as data sources.

The following options constitute “full evaluation” for contract principals:

- A. Full evaluation using all PEPE evaluation instruments every year
- or**
- B. Year one: Full evaluation using all PEPE evaluation instruments
Year two: Use of PDP as the *sole* evaluation instrument
(Cycle is repeated)
- or**
- C. Year one: Full evaluation using all PEPE evaluation instruments
Year two: Use of PDP as the *sole* evaluation instrument
Year three: New/revised PDP as the *sole* evaluation instrument
(Cycle is repeated)
- or**
- D. Year one: Use of PDP as the *sole* evaluation instrument following full evaluation in “probationary” contract year
Year two: New/revised PDP as the *sole* evaluation instrument
Year three: Full evaluation using all PDP evaluation instruments
(Cycle is repeated)

Exceptions for the use of a Professional Development Plan (PDP) as full evaluation:

1. All **probationary** contract principals should undergo full PEPE evaluation using all PEPE evaluation instruments annually (Option A) based on State Board of Education policy.
2. Option A should be implemented immediately following each PDP evaluation year in which progress toward meeting the objectives of the Professional Development Plan (PDP) is deemed unsatisfactory.

Conditions that must exist for a contract principal to use a PDP for his/her full evaluation:

1. The principal is not under a probationary contract.
2. The principal has received a satisfactory score (composite score of 36 or higher) on his/her previous full evaluation.

3. The principal must maintain satisfactory progress toward accomplishment of the objectives of the annual PDP.
4. A “PDP evaluation” may not be used for more than two consecutive years.

At the end of a PDP evaluation year, a statement of satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress and a rationale of why the progress was satisfactory or unsatisfactory must be included with the PDP.

At the end of each PDP evaluation year, a new or revised PDP should be developed regardless of the satisfactory or unsatisfactory status of the PDP.

Table 1 provides a summary of the implementation of full evaluations using all PEPE evaluation instruments and the use of the PDP only (PDP evaluation year).

Table I
Full Evaluation and PDP Annual Evaluation Option

Evaluation Performance	First Probationary Year	Second Probationary Year	First Contract Year	Second Contract Year	Third Contract Year	Fourth Contract Year and Beyond
Satisfactory (Score 36 or higher)	Full Evaluation Using All PEPE Evaluation Instruments	Full Evaluation Using All PEPE Evaluation Instruments	Full Evaluation Using All Evaluation Instruments OR **PDP As Sole Evaluation Instrument	Full evaluation Using All Evaluation Instruments OR **PDP As Sole Evaluation Instrument	Full Evaluation Using All Evaluation Instruments OR **PDP as Sole Evaluation Instrument	Full Evaluation Using All Instruments (then repeat cycle)
Unsatisfactory, but Remediable (Score of 33-35)	Full Evaluation Using All Instruments	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation
Unsatisfactory (Score below 33)	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation	Full Evaluation

****A PDP as the sole evaluation may only be used for two consecutive years. A full evaluation must either precede or follow two years of the PDP as the sole evaluation instrument.**

Notes for Consideration:

- **A full evaluation using all evaluation instruments must occur every three years regardless of the number of years specified in a principal’s contract.**

- **A PDP(s) should not be used as the sole data source to warrant dismissal of a contract principal.**
- **According to the Teacher Accountability Act, Chapter 24 B, in any year in which an annual evaluation does not occur (i.e., annual evaluation using all instruments or annual PDP evaluation), a principal’s contract is automatically extended one year.**

Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Progress

Satisfactory progress toward accomplishment of PDP objectives is present when:

- a) There is evidence that the principal has completed the activities identified for each PDP objective in accordance with the timelines established for those activities on the PDP, or the activity schedule has been adjusted by mutual consent of the principal and evaluator.
- b) There is evidence that the principal is collecting data/information in accordance with assessment methods established for each objective that can later be used to determine if the objective has been accomplished.

Unsatisfactory progress toward accomplishment of PDP objectives is present when:

- There is lack of evidence that either or both of the conditions described in “a” and “ b” above are present.

EVALUATION OF CONTRACT PRINCIPALS

A. Who Is A Contract Principal?

A contract principal is a person employed in Alabama on or after July 1, 2000 by an employing board to serve as the chief administrator of a school, including a vocational center. Persons employed as principals (chief school administrators) before July 1, 2000 are not and will not become contract principals unless they choose to relinquish their continuing service status and be employed by contract.

B. Procedures For Evaluation of Contract Principals

Contract principals should be evaluated with the same instruments and procedures as non-contract principals. However, the timelines for completing the process of full evaluation must be different to accommodate the provisions of Act No. 2000-733 that non-renewal or cancellation of a principal's contract must be by vote of the employing board at least 90 days before the end of the existing contract. Following are the timelines for completion of the evaluation of contract principals:

Schedule for Evaluating Contract Principals

There are fourteen (14) steps in the principal evaluation process. Each of these steps is explained below, and a suggested timeline is provided for each step. However, the evaluation for contract principals must be completed by March 15 of the school year to ensure that the 90-day requirement for notification of non-renewal/cancellation of the contract can be met.

Step 1: Orientation

(By October 30)

All principals to be evaluated should receive an orientation manual and participate in an orientation session provided by the LEA. (Master copies of the orientation manual will be provided to the LEA by the State Department of Education.)

Step 2: Self-Assessment

(By November 15)

An optional self-assessment form has been included in the instrumentation. This form is completed by the principal as a self-appraisal of knowledge and skills and performance. The form is not part of the evaluation process and will not be used in determining scores. It is the property of the principal completing it. He/she is not required to share the results with anyone or to submit the form for review by the evaluator or any other representative of the LEA. If the principal chooses to reveal scores to the evaluator for the process of formulating a Professional Development Plan, he/she may do so. The Self-Assessment should be completed before the formal evaluation process begins.

Step 3: Distribution of Surveys

(By January 5)

During every full evaluation year, the principal will distribute surveys to several, but not all stakeholder groups, collect the responses, analyze or have the data analyzed (scored), interpret the results, and offer reflections on the results. Detailed explanation of this process is provided in the section on surveys. The surveys have been developed and provided by the State Department of Education to match expectations of principal performance in 11 of the 13 knowledge/skill areas. The surveys should be distributed by January 5 to allow time for their return and time for the principal to analyze and interpret the data and offer reflections on the results. The surveys should be returned no later than February 1. NOTE: The surveys may be administered at any time during the year, but it is recommended that principals in their first or second years in a building wait long enough to allow a fair assessment of their efforts during the current year by their constituents.

Step 4: Preparation of Principal Portfolio

(By February 5)

The principal is responsible for developing lines of evidence (more than one piece of evidence) to demonstrate the level of one's knowledge/skills in 11 of the 13 areas being assessed. More information is provided in the section of the manual entitled, Principal Portfolio.

In most cases, a principal should not have to (and is not encouraged to) create materials for the evaluation process. It will be a matter of selecting evidential material from the abundance of material generated by the principal in carrying out daily activities and working to improve the school. Although the portfolio is to be submitted by February 10 to the evaluator, the principal should begin selecting/preparing lines of evidence (portfolio entries) immediately after his/her orientation.

Step 5: School Management Observation

(By February 10)

The evaluator conducts the school management observation. This observation can be conducted at any time during the second semester of the evaluation year. The observation should be conducted by February 10.

NOTE: An evaluator or evaluator team can conduct a second formal observation, if it is deemed important to gather more or different data.

Step 6: Supervisor's Review Form

(By February 10)

There are a few areas of principal knowledge and skill (e.g., ability to carry out professional responsibilities) in which the immediate supervisor is an important source of data. In those areas, the immediate supervisor's experiences with the principal are recorded on the Supervisor's Review Form and reviewed at the end of the data collection process together with other relevant data. The immediate supervisor should complete this form and enter it into the principal's file no later than February 10 before the portfolio submitted by the principal is analyzed.

Step 7: Preparation of Survey Data

(By February 10)

After the principal distributes and collects the surveys, he/she then analyzes and interprets the data and offers reflections on the results. The survey report providing an interpretation of the response data should be submitted to the evaluator by February 10. (Detailed explanation of this process is provided in the section on surveys.)

Step 8: Principal's Submission of Portfolio

(By February 10)

As indicated in previous comments, the principal will submit his/her portfolio to the evaluator by February 10. A deadline is important because the evaluation process cannot be concluded until the evaluator has had time to carefully review the work submitted.

Step 9: Interview Session (Part A)

(By February 18)

The interview has two parts: Part A and Part B. Part A is a structured interview containing several questions to be commonly asked of all principals. Part B is a clarifying interview and is addressed in Step 11. The structured interview can be either oral or written. An oral interview session, where the evaluator asks the questions and records (scripts) the principal's answers, can be scheduled anytime during the second semester, but the interview must be completed by February 18. If the principal chooses to provide written responses to the structured interview, these responses must be submitted by February 18.

The structured interview data are considered as yet another line of evidence of principal knowledge/skill in 7 of the 13 areas being evaluated. They will be considered together with other available data when developing scores at the end of the process.

Step 10: Evaluator Review of Portfolio

(By February 18)

The evaluator should conduct a review of the portfolio to determine if he/she has any questions about its contents. The questions developed from this review, if any, are intended to clarify any of the materials submitted and should be asked in the clarifying part of the interview (see Step 11). Thus, the timely completion of the next step in the process must be considered in the schedule an evaluator sets for reviewing portfolios.

Step 11: Interview Session (Part B)

(By February 25)

Part B of this session is devoted to probing questions that the evaluator asks to bring clarification and understanding to his/her analysis of the principal's portfolio entries or the written interview, if that option was selected. In other words, questions asked in this part of the session will differ from principal to principal. Evaluators will make notes as principals respond to assist them in the final review of the lines of evidence provided by principals.

NOTE: Interview Parts A (structured interview) and B (clarifying interview) can be conducted in the same setting or at different times as the evaluator and principal agree. The clarifying interview session must be held to promote dialogue about and understanding of the principal's presentations in a written interview. Questions about portfolio contents are optional. In many situations they may not be needed.

Step 12: Scoring the Lines of Evidence

(By March 7)

The evaluator will score each of the 13 knowledge/skill areas based on the lines of evidence gathered through the principal's portfolio, the survey report, the school management observation, the interview, and supervisor's review. The evaluator uses the score level descriptions (rationales) provided for each area. More detail can be found in the scoring section of this manual.

Step 13: Evaluation Summary Conference

(By March 12)

Once the evaluator has developed the final set of scores, an Evaluation Summary Conference is to be held. The purposes of the conference are to a) share scores and rationales with the principal and b) prepare with him/her a Professional Development Plan to serve as a guide for improvement in weaker areas over the next year. This conference should be held by March 12.

Step 14: Submission of Evaluation Summary Reports

(By March 15)

Evaluation Summary Reports shall be submitted/filed as per LEA personnel policies/guidelines. Periodically, a copy of the report will be submitted to the State Department of Education for statewide reviews/validation. In some cases, the State Department of Education may request that copies of all materials, including the portfolio, be submitted as part of the review of the evaluation process.

C. Performance Standards

Act No. 2000-733 identifies three levels of performance for a contract principal: satisfactory, unsatisfactory but remediable, and unsatisfactory. A standard setting panel of Alabama administrators, teachers, and appropriate representatives of the higher education community has recommended cutoff scores that define these performance levels. The State Board of Education approved the panel's

recommendation on February 8, 2001. These scores are derived from summing the evaluator's scores for all 13 knowledge/skills areas. The resultant performance levels are:

- Satisfactory Performance - score of 36 or higher;
- Unsatisfactory But Remediable Performance - a score not lower than 33 and not higher than 35;
- Unsatisfactory Performance - any score below 33.

D. Actions Resulting From Unsatisfactory But Remediable Performance Scores

All principal evaluations result in a Professional Development Plan (PDP) to be carried out by the evaluatee under the guidance and supervision of the evaluator, as prescribed in this manual. However, Act No. 2000-733 mandates that a contract principal receiving an unsatisfactory but remediable evaluation score (score of 33-35) shall complete a professional development plan addressing the area or areas of unsatisfactory performance prior to the next evaluation. This follow-up evaluation will take place the year following the evaluation that results in the low score. If improvement has not occurred, as evidenced by the second evaluation, the Act requires that the chief executive officer of the school system must either 1) recommend to the local board of education cancellation of the principal's contract, or 2) place him/her on a second, one-year professional development plan with accompanying evaluation.

E. Actions Resulting From Unsatisfactory Performance Scores

A contract principal whose performance on an evaluation is unsatisfactory (score below 33) is subject to cancellation of contract. If the chief executive officer of the school system chooses* to recommend cancellation of contract, the principal may request a review of the evaluation. The request must be made to the chief executive officer of the school system within 15 days of his/her receipt of the CEO's recommendation.

Within five (5) days of the request for review of the evaluation, the CEO or designee shall request from the State Department of Education a list of five persons who are certified to evaluate contract principals and review evaluations. From this list the CEO and the contract principal shall each strike two names. The State Superintendent of Education or designee shall then designate the remaining person on the list to conduct the evaluation review. The review shall be completed within 30 days after the request for a review has been received by the chief executive officer of the school system.

The reviewer, upon completion of his/her review of the evaluation can recommend to the State Department of Education one of two actions:

- uphold the results of the evaluation,
- overturn the results of the evaluation,

In either case, the chief executive officer of the school system and the principal shall be informed in writing of the reviewer's recommendation and the State Department of Education's decision with the reasons for the decision clearly stated.

* It is generally unwise to recommend cancellation of a principal's contract until the principal has been informed of his/her weaknesses as evidenced in the evaluation and given opportunity to improve performance.