General Information

LEA Name:
Bensalem Township SD

AUN Number:
122091002

Address:
3000 Donallen Dr Bensalem, PA 19020-1898

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:
David E. Baugh

For Information Contact:
Robert J. Cardillo

Email:
rcardillo@bensalemsd.org

Phone:
215-750-2800, Ext 4003

Teacher Information

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:
Bensalem School District's current teacher evaluation system utilizes the following forms: PDE Semi-Evaluation Form for Instructional I Teachers, PDE 427 Instructional I to Instructional II Assessment Form, PDE 428 Annual Employee Evaluation Form., Bensalem School District (BSD) Data Collection Form, BSD post Observation Conference Form, and the Pathwise Framework Observation Program Feedback Form. Use of the Pathwise Framework Observation Program Feedback Form, published by the Teaching & Learning Division of the Educational Testing Services (ETS), is predicated in part on the research and published material by Charlotte Danielson and Thomas McGreal. When performing a formal classroom evaluation, the evaluator utilizes the Pathwise Feedback Form rubric to assist in determining the level of performance displayed by the teacher during the classroom observation. The level of performance range is unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished. Four (4) major domains are evaluated. They are Planning & Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibility. The evaluated teacher then receives a copy of the completed Pathwise Feedback rubric at the scheduled post observation conference each teacher has with the evaluator. When the semi-annual or annual evaluation forms are required to be completed and sent to the Superintendent for his/her review, the evaluator will reflect on the formal classroom evaluation(s) that took place during the school year. In addition, the principal evaluator will gather and review various sources of evidence within the school district, including material/evidence presented by the teacher, and make evaluative judgements regarding each of the four (4) categories of teaching as reflected on either the PDE 426 or PDE 428 Forms, as well as the overall performance/evaluation of the teacher. In making these judgements and weighing all available evidence, the evaluator considers the relative importance of each of the different categories and the various aspects of teaching.

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

a. Teacher Development? No
b. Teacher Compensation? No
c. Teacher Promotions? No
d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Two (2) unsatisfactory evaluations may lead to termination of employment. Teachers who receive an unsatisfactory performance rating/evaluation are routinely placed on an improvement plan which allows the teacher the opportunity of eliminating their deficiencies and leading to a satisfactory evaluation.

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)? More than 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? Yes

Utilization of the "Pathwise Framework Observation Program Feedback Form" rubric, published by the Teaching & learning Division of the Educational Testing Services (ETS), was predicated on the research and published material of Charlotte Danielson and Thomas McGreal.

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

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

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:
### LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<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></td>
<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></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert K Shafer MS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>45 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell C Struble El Sch</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>1 3 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>32 97 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley El Sch</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 2.8 %</td>
<td>1 2.8 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>34 94.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia Snyder MS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 2.5 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>39 97.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Hills El Sch</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>38 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Twp HS</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1 0.8 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>127 99.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Rush El Sch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 2.9 %</td>
<td>1 2.9 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>32 94.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel K Faust El Sch</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3 7.7 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>36 92.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwells El Sch</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 2.8 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>35 97.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>429</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 1.9 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 0.7 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>418 97.4 %</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:
Principals are evaluated on an annual basis, in part utilizing the PDE 5501 Form and the Administrative Appraisal Performance Assessment Scale Rubric. In addition, myriad of other evaluative/performance indicators are utilized to determine the overall proficiency of the principal. Sixteen (16) minimal performance assessments are evaluated, including Personal Characteristics, Leadership Characteristics, Success in Problem Solving, Professional Knowledge and Understanding, Success in Supervision, Ability to Build morale, Community Relations, Attention to Detail and Routine, Instructional Program, Financial Responsibilities, Relations with Students, Relations with Departments of the Office of the Superintendent, Behavior as a Team Player, Customer Service, Progress Towards meeting annual Goals, and School/Plant Facilities Utilization/Management.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes
   
   Principal performance successes or failures identified may cause initiation of individual or group professional development activities designed to address shortcomings and/or improve performance even further.

b. Principal Compensation? No

c. Principal Promotions? No

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

   In part, the formal principal performance evaluations are utilized to assist in determining the appropriateness of continued employment. In all cases, performance improvement plans would be developed for below basic principal evaluations in order to assist the struggling individual in becoming successful. Many factors are taken into consideration throughout the school year in addition to the actual formal performance evaluation.

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

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? Yes

b. Student Growth Data? Yes

   In addition to the completion of the principal's performance assessment rubric, a written anecdotal narrative evaluation and comments are provided to each building principal. This narrative document would/may include comments relative to student achievement outcome, student growth data, as well as a whole host of other evaluative comments and/or suggestions.

**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? If Yes, describe background and process. Yes

   Principals are evaluated based upon sixteen (16) performance assessment categories. Each category is defined. The range of evaluation is unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished.

**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 at Standarized Principal Evaluation System?** Yes

**LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:**
<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>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>9 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</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 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.