Pennsylvania  
Department of Education  
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information  
Individual LEA Data  
For the 2013-14 Rating Period  

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Name of LEQ or Charter School:**  
Abington SD

**AUN Number:**  
123460302

**Address of LEA or Charter School:**  
970 Highland Ave  Abington, PA  19001

**Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:**  
Dr. Amy Sichel

**For Information Contact:**  
Susanne Alfonso

**Email:**  
susannealfonso@abington.k12.pa.us

**Phone:**  
215-881-2509

---

### TEACHER INFORMATION

If the LEA does not use their teacher evaluation system as a basis for the following, their decision criteria is provided:

a. Professional Development?

b. Teacher Compensation?
   
   Compensation is based upon a negotiated salary matrix. Employees' placement on the salary matrix is determined by the employee's years of experience and number of graduate credits.

c. Teacher Advancement/Promotions?
Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators? (Charter Schools Only)
   a. Yes or No? If Yes, describe background and process.

Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion: (Charter Schools Only)
   a. Student Achievement Outcomes?
   b. Student Growth Data?

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:
   a. Temporary Professionals (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year
   b. Professionals (More than 3 Years)? Annually

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:
   Number Rated 552
   Number Not Rated 11
   Total Number Employed 563

LEA Teacher Evaluations 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>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abington JHS  |  130  |  3  |  2.3%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  127  |  97.7%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  127  |  97.7%  
Abington SHS  |  126  |  2  |  1.6%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  124  |  98.4%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  124  |  98.4%  
Copper Beech Sch  |  75  |  1  |  1.3%  |  0  |  0%  |  1  |  1.3%  |  73  |  97.3%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  74  |  98.7%  
Highland Sch  |  37  |  1  |  2.7%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  36  |  97.3%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  36  |  97.3%  
McKinley Sch  |  47  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  47  |  100%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  47  |  100%  
Overlook Sch  |  40  |  2  |  5%  |  0  |  0%  |  1  |  2.5%  |  37  |  92.5%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  38  |  95%  
Roslyn Sch  |  35  |  1  |  2.9%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  34  |  97.1%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  34  |  97.1%  
Rydal East Sch  |  41  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  41  |  100%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  41  |  100%  
Willow Hill Sch  |  32  |  1  |  3.1%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  31  |  96.9%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  31  |  96.9%  
Totals  |  563  |  11  |  2%  |  0  |  0%  |  2  |  0.4%  |  550  |  97.7%  |  0  |  0%  |  0  |  0%  |  552  |  98%  

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

**PRINCIPAL INFORMATION**

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

The Abington School District administrator evaluation form is completed minimally once a year by the Superintendent for each principal. The principals are numerically rated using a rubric (5 - Meritorious, 4 - Superior, 3 - Fully Satisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 1 - Unacceptable) in the areas of Improvement of Instruction; Student Achievement; Employee Supervision, Observation and Evaluation; Employee Development; Decision - Making; Judgment; Leadership; Organizational Management; Management of Physical Resources; Management of Financial Resources; Communications (oral and written); Professional Preparation; Personal Qualities; and General Level of Performance. All evaluations are supported by anecdotal records and reports that substantiate the evaluation, as well as, an evaluation of student performance using multiple measures including the PSSA, Keystone, AYP, PVAAS, SAT, AP results, attendance, etc. and district assessments. Appropriate comments about performance elements indicating factors contributing to success or by indicating action to be taken to improve the level of success are added. A conference between each principal and the superintendent is held. During that conference, key areas of achievement to be assessed are identified and annual goals are established. These areas of focus are reflected by a significant and representative portion of the work performed by and/or the skills required of the principal. Specific standards of performance, which are dictated by the goals established, are set at that time. A Progress Conference is held during the months of January - February to review performance relative to the elements of evaluation and the goals established. New standards of accomplishment or additional tasks are established at the progress conference to help ensure that continuous improvement is ongoing, and that standards and goals are ultimately met. This process will be replaced by the PDE Principal Effectiveness Evaluation procedure for the 2014-15 school year.

If the LEA does not use their principal evaluation system as a basis for the following, their decision criteria is provided:

a. Principal Development?

b. Principal Compensation?

c. Principal Promotions?
Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

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

Principals develop performance objectives congruent with district-wide initiatives using the Pennsylvania "Getting Results" plan format designed to improve student achievement. Principals are held accountable to monitor student achievement; analyze and understand test data; utilize evaluation techniques appropriate to educational objective; review grade distribution; review teacher tests and other means of student assessment; take appropriate action if student performance is inconsistent with abilities and take appropriate action to ensure that teacher assessment of student performance is consistent with student aptitude and output.

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

5 - Meritorious, 4 - Superior, 3 - Fully Satisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 1 - Unacceptable

Does your LEA have at least one Principal position? Yes
Does your LEA have at Standardized Principal Evaluation System? Yes

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Numerator)</th>
<th>(Denominator)</th>
<th>(Numerator)</th>
<th>(Denominator)</th>
<th>(Numerator)</th>
<th>(Denominator)</th>
<th>(Numerator)</th>
<th>(Denominator)</th>
<th>(Numerator)</th>
<th>(Denominator)</th>
<th>(Numerator)</th>
<th>(Denominator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</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.*