

Pennsylvania  
Department of Education  
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information  
Individual LEA Data  
For the 2012-13 Rating Period

---

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

---

**LEA Name:**

Armstrong SD

**AUN Number:**

128030852

**Address:**

410 Main St Ford City, PA 16226

**Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:**

Dr. Stan J. Chapp, Superintendent

**For Information Contact:**

Nancy E. Kozuch

**Email:**

Nkozuch@asd.k12.pa.us

**Phone:**

724-548-6058

---

**TEACHER INFORMATION**

---

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

The Armstrong School District recruits, employs, and retains highly qualified personnel, as defined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, to educate its students and lead the district. All district professional educators and administrators participate in professional growth opportunities on a variety of subjects pertinent to the overall educational mission of the school district. The district's Professional Education Plan incorporates a comprehensive teacher supervision model which includes an evaluation and observation plan. The purpose of teacher supervision is to maximize student learning and is an ongoing process specifically targeted at improving the quality of instruction. This focus emphasizes and places a high priority on differentiated supervision with an emphasis on continuous professional growth to ensure effective instruction and strong instructional leadership. The Armstrong School District evaluates professional educators using PDE forms 426, 427, and 428. The PDE forms are based on the Danielson model of effective teaching and support research. Principals and central office staff conduct annual observations of Instructional II teachers and quarterly observations of Instructional I teachers. Indicators on these forms are used to identify and correct instructional weaknesses and in turn improve the quality of instruction provided to our students.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

The evaluations are used to identify trends presented to the Professional Education Committee for consideration. Plans for improvement include targets from evaluations.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

c. Teacher Promotions? No

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Results of teacher performance evaluations inform decisions about teacher employment because two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a professional employee are necessary for dismissal. The teacher performance evaluation provides an opportunity for the professional employee to improve by developing an improvement plan with the supervisor.

**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 422

Number Not Rated 3

Total Number Employed 425

**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
Lenape Technical School	7	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	7 100 %
West Hills Intermediate Sch	40	1 2.5 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	39 97.5 %
West Hills Primary Sch	49	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	49 100 %
West Shamokin JSHS	58	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	58 100 %
Shannock Valley EI Sch	27	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	27 100 %
Ford City JSHS	57	0 0 %	1 1.8 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	56 98.2 %
Elderton EI Sch	23	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	23 100 %
Kittanning JHS	34	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	34 100 %
Lenape EI Sch	56	2 3.6 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	54 96.4 %
Kittanning SHS	51	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	51 100 %
Dayton EI Sch	23	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	0 0 %	23 100 %
<b>Totals</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>3 0.7 %</b>	<b>1 0.2 %</b>	<b>0 0 %</b>	<b>0 0 %</b>	<b>0 0 %</b>	<b>0 0 %</b>	<b>421 99.1 %</b>

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 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:

The Armstrong School District evaluates administrators annually using PDE form 428. The PDE form is based on the Danielson model of effective teaching and support research. The principle accountabilities include program management, staff relations, student relations, including interscholastic and/or student activities, fiscal management, community relations, facilities management, leadership, etc. The administrator's performance and effectiveness is assessed based upon principle accountabilities and accomplishment of system-wide goals and objectives. A mid-point review is used to discuss achievement and system-wide objectives. The method of annual appraisal consists of a self-appraisal, evaluator's appraisal, and an employee appraisal. A "360 Degree" Professional Development Review can also be used and is recognized as a process for professional growth and development tool for administrators. After the appropriate documentation is prepared, the supervisor meets with each principal to discuss the report and develop goals and objectives for the next year. Principals rated unsatisfactory in a given area participate in professional development opportunities related to their deficiencies.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes

The principal performance evaluations are used to focus professional development topics throughout the year. Plans for improvement target professional development.

b. Principal Compensation? No

c. Principal Promotions? Yes

The results of principal performance evaluations are used as the basis for advancement opportunities.

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

Results of principal performance evaluations inform decisions about a principal's employment because two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings of a professional employee are necessary for dismissal. The principal's performance evaluation provides an opportunity for the professional employee to improve by developing an improvement plan with the supervisor.

**Does the LEA principal 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 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. No

**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 Standardized Principal Evaluation System?** Yes

**LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:**

Number Rated	8
Number Not Rated	<u>2</u>
Total Number Employed	<u><u>10</u></u>

**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					Satisfactory
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2 20%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>0 0%</b>	<b>8 80%</b>

Note: - 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 deduced , we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5