

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2011-12 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Lancaster-Lebanon IU 13

AUN Number:

113000000

Address:

1020 New Holland Avenue Lancaster, PA 17601

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

Dr. Cynthia Burkhart

For Information Contact:

Deb Wiley

Email:

deb_wiley@iu13.org

Phone:

717606-1903

TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA's system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:

In July 2009, an Evaluation System Charter was formed to enhance and update the evaluation tool utilized by IU 13. The previous tool was based on the work of Charlotte Danielson "Enhancing Professional Practice - A Framework for Teaching." The work of James H. Strong and Pamela D. Tucker - "Teacher Evaluation - Assessing and Improving Performance" was reviewed and a crosswalk comparison to Danielson's work was completed. The new summative evaluation form focuses on student achievement, aligns with the strategic priorities of IU 13 and is a blend of the former form and PDE forms (426, 427, and 428). The new summative form was approved by the Board of School Directors on November 10, 2010 and by PDE on December 23, 2010. The system is designed to connect the supervision and evaluation process to IU 13 professional interview and selection process, mentor development, induction program, professional development and federal, state, local and IU 13 Department and Programmatic Expectations. The evaluation system is a three tiered system made up of 5 domains with twenty-six performance standards and performance indicators. Performance indicators were developed with thirty job-alike professional groups. Performance indicators capture the diversity of the professional roles within the organization and assist both the professional and the supervisor in better defining what a domain and standard "look like and sound like" within a specific role. The Summative Evaluation Report is completed annually for tenured staff and twice per year for non-tenured staff by the assigned Supervisor of Special Education. Rubrics define the four levels of performance for each performance standard. A four-step rubric allows for a range of ratings: Unsatisfactory (Does not adequately fulfill responsibilities resulting in inferior performance that negatively impacts student progress and/or behavior), Needs Improvement (Inconsistently meets responsibilities resulting in less than quality work performance and lack of student progress and/or inappropriate student behavior), Meets Expectations (Consistently fulfills responsibilities resulting in quality work that impacts student progress and/or behavior in a positive manner. This rating is a high performance criterion and is expected of all educators), and Exceeds Expectation (Performance exceeds required responsibilities, consistently producing exemplary work that optimizes student progress and behavior). The summative evaluation report is designed to be summative in nature, reflecting not one single observation, but based on a preponderance of evidence and artifacts accumulated over time. The summative report is based on formative data that has been collected throughout the school year by the immediate supervisor, other IU administrators, the individual being evaluated (through the person's professional portfolio), school district administrative staff, artifacts such as student work, IEP's, reports, memos, and other credible input sources including parents and other professionals. The framework, which organizes the twenty-six performance standards, is divided into five domains as described next. First, Program Management and Learning Environment which includes the professional's standards for planning and demonstrating effective routines and procedures that create a safe, organized, and productive learning environment/program and facilitates change as needed. Second, Direct Services and Instruction encompasses both organizing for services/instruction and delivery of services/instruction. The major standards include planning and implementing a variety of activities consistent with instructional objectives and selecting instructional methods compatible with student abilities, strengths, and learning styles. Next, Assessment/Monitoring of Learning includes the standards for conducting evaluation and providing feedback to students that encourages student progress and measures student achievement. This domain incorporates the process of using data to measure and improve student performance and/or program effectiveness. Next, Collaboration: Communication and Community Relations domain which includes the professional's standards for establishing, maintaining, and enhancing relationships through effective communication with families, colleagues, and others to facilitate and coordinate delivery of services and community involvement. The fifth domain, Professionalism, defines the standards for demonstrating a commitment to professional ethics and growth while advancing the mission, goals, and policies of the organization. Each of the twenty-six performance standards are rated utilizing the rubric. Each of the five domains also has a summative rating representing the professional's overall performance in that domain. The IU supervisor has discretion to determine the value of each performance standard in deriving the rating for each domain. Each of the five domain ratings shall be considered in the overall summative rating of either Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory. The Department Director will review all summative reports. All summative reports shall be reviewed with the professional employee through a summative conference. Supervisor Induction Sessions provide new supervisors with training regarding the frequency and content of the evaluation system. In addition, time is allocated for question and answer related to the evaluation system at monthly supervisor meetings.

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

- a. Teacher Development? Yes
 - Special Education Supervisors use teacher evaluation data to inform the planning and preparation for Act 80 Days and other professional development training.
- b. Teacher Compensation? No
 - NA
- c. Teacher Promotions? No
 - NA
- d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

A nontenured teacher who receives an unsatisfactory evaluation may be placed on an Intensive Assistance Improvement Plan or if appropriate given the option to resign over being terminated. Tenured teachers who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation will be placed on an Intensive Assistance Improvement Plan. Once the plan is completed the employee's Supervisor must complete a summative evaluation within ten working days. An unsatisfactory evaluation at this point would constitute the second consecutive unsatisfactory evaluation and would be grounds for dismissal.

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

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes? No
- b. Student Growth Data? No
 - NA

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. Yes

The Professional Evaluation System is comprised of five domains and twenty-six performance standards. The system includes rubrics that are based on the work of James H. Strong and Pamela D. Tucker - "Teacher Evaluation - Assessing and Improving Performance" and Charlotte Danielson - "Enhancing Professional Practice - A Framework for Teaching."

Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

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

NA

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated	323
Number Not Rated	3
Total Number Employed	326

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	NA	NA	NA	NA	Satisfactory
Lancaster-Lebanon IU 13	326	3 0.9 %	3 0.9 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	320 98.2 %

Totals	326	3 0.9 %	3 0.9 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	320 98.2 %
---------------	------------	----------------	----------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-------------------

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numberator) by the building total (Denominator)

- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numberator) by the overall total (Denominator)

***In order to ensure that individual ratings can not be deducted , 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:

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

- a. Principal Development?
- b. Principal Compensation?
- c. Principal Promotions?
- d. Principal Retention and Removal?

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

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes?
- b. Student Growth Data?

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

- a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)?
- b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)?

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.

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position?

No

Does your LEA have at Standarized Principal Evaluation System?

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated

Number Not Rated

_____0

Total Number Employed

=====

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	NA	NA	NA	NA	Satisfactory
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 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