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GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:
Avonworth SD

AUN Number:
103020753

Address:
258 Josephs Lane  Pittsburgh, PA 15237-1223

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
Dr. Valerie McDonald

For Information Contact:
Dr. Valerie McDonald

Email:
vmcdonald@avonworth.k12.pa.us

Phone:
412-369-8738

TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:
Our district uses PDE form 426 to evaluate our teachers. The PDE forms are based on the Danielson model of effective teaching and supporting research. We use the indicators on these forms to help our principals as they evaluate the teachers during annual observations of Instructional II teachers and semi-annual observations of Instructional I teachers. Teachers who are identified as needing improvement are observed monthly with intense coaching between observations. Special attention is focused on those indicators related to teachers’ use of differentiated instruction based on individual student’s needs. Differentiated instruction is one of our district strategic goals and is the focus of professional development. Training on the use of differentiated instruction is provided to our entire staff including both teachers and principals as part of our Act 48 In-service programs from our intermediate unit and PaTTAN. Additional individual professional development is available for teachers who are found to need improvement through the observation process. This training heavily emphasizes how teachers can use student achievement to inform instruction. The observation form rates the teachers on a scale using the following categories: N-Needs Improvement, S-Satisfactory, U-Unsatisfactory, W/D-Was Not Observed or Did Not Apply. Teachers are rated on the PDE 5501 (DEBE 333) in the following categories: Personality, Preparation, Technique, and Pupil Reaction. A narrative that describes a lesson and/or professional activity provides the teacher feedback focusing on differentiated instruction, technology integration, formative and summative assessment, student engagement, and growth. Our district does not use the evaluation system to inform salary decisions, however, unsatisfactory evaluations can lead to dismissal.

Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? Yes
   
   Our Act 48 committee regularly reviews data from redacted teacher observations to help formulate the subsequent years professional development program.

b. Teacher Compensation? No
   NA

c. Teacher Promotions? No
   NA

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes
   
   Our district follows the PA Code and prepares for dismissal after teachers receive 2 consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
   
   NA

b. Student Growth Data? NA

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

a. New Teachers (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year
   
   NA

b. Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Annually

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators?

a. Yes or No?  If Yes, describe background and process. No
   NA

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) No
LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated: 114
Number Not Rated: 
Total Number Employed: 114

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Standard Evaluation System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Total Employed (Numerator)</th>
<th>Not Rated (Numerator)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (Numerator)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (Numerator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avonworth El Sch</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avonworth HS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avonworth MS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the building total (Denominator)
- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator)
*In order to ensure that individual ratings cannot be deduced, we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5

Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:
The Avonworth School District evaluates its principals annually using the School Leadership that Works model developed by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty. The principals are also assessed on attainment of organizational goals derived from this framework and linked to our current strategic plan. This assessment measures principals’ effectiveness as change agents relevant to the 21 responsibilities of the school leader. Monthly meetings are held between the superintendent and the principal to review organizational goals, discuss building issues and ongoing initiatives. Special attention is given to teacher observations and student achievement. These meetings serve as formative assessment towards the final evaluation. Each principal prepares a professional portfolio of accomplishments based upon individual goals and presents the portfolio to the superintendent. Final written feedback is given to substantiate the performance rating and salary for the subsequent year. After the evaluation results have been interpreted and the individual principal’s reports are prepared, the superintendent meets with each principal to discuss the report and to develop personal performance goals for the next year. Principals rated below basic are given intensive professional development and mentoring related to their deficiencies, and another evaluation is administered in six months. If the principal’s performance has not improved, the principal is recommended to the board for dismissal. PDE form 5501 is completed for each principal.

Does the LEA use the results of the principal evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Principal Development? Yes
   Each principal develops organizational goals related to the district's strategic plan and reports monthly to the superintendent and the board on progress of goal attainment. The goals dictate the types of individualized professional development each principal pursues.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes
   Aptitude in the 21 responsibilities of School Leadership described by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty, as well as their ability to implement first and second order change as applying to the rubric in the Act 93 agreement determines compensation for principals.

c. Principal Promotions? NA

NA

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes
   Avonworth School District values continuous improvement on the performance of principals. Principals receiving an ineffective rating will receive intensive one-on-one mentoring and a specific performance plan for the following year. A second unsatisfactory rating will result in dismissal.

Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? Yes

b. Student Growth Data? Yes

Our principals are evaluated on their aptitude in the 21 responsibilities of School Leadership described by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty, as well as their ability to implement first and second order change.

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)? Annually

b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)? Annually

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide principal evaluators?

a. Yes or No? Yes
   If Yes, describe background and process.

Our district's rubric is derived from Conceptual Framework: School Leadership that Works, Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2005): 5% Exceptional Performance – Clearly and consistently surpasses mutually agreed-upon objectives and job description so results have a significant impact. Creates original or innovative systems designed to promote district values, effective operations, and accountability. Exemplifies leadership and vision.

4% Positive Performance - Meets or occasionally surpasses mutually agreed-upon objectives and job description so results have a positive impact. Consistently produces quality work that promotes district values, effective operations, and accountability. 2% Needs Improvement – Performance shows deficiencies in attainment of established standards of the position description, individual goals, and requires improvement in order to meet school district expectations; individual is aware of deficiencies and is motivated to improve. 1% Below Expectations – Inconsistently meets the minimum requirement as outlined in objectives and job description. Results indicate less than quality work and little motivation to improve. Minimal evidence of establishing systems and procedures designed to promote district values, effective operations, or
accountability. Unsatisfactory - Failed to meet minimum requirement as outlined in objectives and job description or unable to provide evidence of meeting the objective.

**Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?**

- a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) No

**NA**

**LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating System</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating/Title</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Failed to meet minimum requirement as outlined in objectives and job description or unable to provide evidence of meeting the objective.
| Totals | * | * | *% | * | *% | * | *% | * | *% | * | *% | * | *% |

Note: All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator).

*In order to ensure that individual ratings cannot be deduced, we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5.