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 an 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
   We tailor professional development for the specific needs of our teachers. An example is that we provide in-district training on differentiated instruction, and base the trainings on what is observed during instruction. We also provide technology trainings, again based upon the level of expertise we observe during instruction. Our strategic plan guides the implementation of practices that enhance personalized instruction, and we provide on-going support to teachers throughout the school year.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Teachers are not only rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, if necessary, but they are also provided coaching or mentors and are placed on improvement plans if they need help. These mentors work closely with struggling teachers on lesson design and instruction. The improvement plan specifies areas in need of improvement, and administrators meet frequently with struggling teachers. After appropriate time is given, if teaching performance has not improved with supports in place, we make decisions about continued employment.

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

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No

b. Student Growth Data? No

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

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

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

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: 120
Number Not Rated: 0
Total Number Employed: 120

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Level 1 (Numerator)</th>
<th>Level 2 (Numerator)</th>
<th>Level 3 (Numerator)</th>
<th>Level 4 (Numerator)</th>
<th>Level 5 (Numerator)</th>
<th>Level 6 (Numerator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avonworth MS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avonworth HS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avonworth El Sch</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>120 %</strong></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 can not 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

**PRINCIPAL INFORMATION**

Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:
The Superintendent of the Avonworth School District evaluates its principals annually using the School Leadership that Works model developed by Marzano, Waters, 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. After the evaluation results have been interpreted and the individual principal’s evaluation 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
   All professional development for principals is derived from needs as outlined by our Strategic Plan or areas of responsibility that need to be enhanced. Our most recent focus has been on training for differentiating instruction, interdisciplinary learning, and 21st Century skills.

b. Principal Compensation? Yes
   Principals who are successful in promoting teachers’ ability to differentiate instruction, collaborate with peers, and focus on 21st Century skills are rated as Positive or Exemplary Performance with compensation commensurate with the rating. Principals who need improvement or are unsatisfactory receive no additional compensation.

c. Principal Promotions? Yes
   Principals who are successful in promoting teachers’ ability to differentiate instruction, collaborate with peers, and focus on 21st Century skills are rated as Positive or Exemplary Performance with compensation commensurate with the rating. Exemplary principals receive higher pay than positive performance principals. Advancement in position or status is dependent upon certifications held, other qualifications, and interest.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes
   Principals who are rated as needs improvement or unsatisfactory are given ample opportunities to improve. If they do not improve, they are recommended for removal.

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

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? Yes
   Principals are rated on their responsibilities that correlate with student achievement as listed by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005). Predominant responsibilities include situational awareness, flexibility, outreach, monitoring and evaluating, culture, knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment, change agent, intellectual stimulation, and communication. Student achievement on PSSA and growth data from PVAAS are considered, and strategies are implemented to improve student achievement and growth, if necessary, through working to improve attainment of the characteristics within these responsibilities.

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?
The Avonworth School District evaluates its principals annually using the School Leadership that Works model developed by Marzano, Waters, 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.

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

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

   No

**Does your LEA have at least one Principal position?**

Yes

**Does your LEA have a Standardized Principal Evaluation System?**

Yes

**LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:**

| Number Rated | 3 |
| Number Not Rated | 0 |
| Total Number Employed | 3 |

**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>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* %</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>* %</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.*