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:
Armstrong SD

AUN Number:
128030852

Address of LEA or Charter School:
181 Heritage Park Drive, Suite 2  Kittanning, PA 16201-7025

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

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?
   Advancement and compensation is addressed in the Armstrong Education Association's Collective Bargaining Agreement.

c. Teacher Advancement/Promotions?
The rating system shall be devised by the PDE using the prescribed PDE forms. Any teacher under an improvement plan shall also be subject to the specific requirements of that plan as it relates to the teacher’s

d. Teacher Retention and Removal?

---

**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.  
  
  **Not Applicable!**

---

**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:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Rated</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Not Rated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Employed</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**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>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Principal Ratings</td>
<td>Assistant Principal Ratings</td>
<td>Total Principal Ratings</td>
<td>Assistant Principal Ratings</td>
<td>Total Assistant Principal Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton El Sch</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 4.5%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>21 95.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderton JH</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 4.5%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>21 95.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford City JHS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>21 95.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittanning JH</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>33 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittanning SHS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1 1.9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>33 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenape El Sch</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>59 98.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenape Vocational/Technical Sch</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannock Valley El Sch</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>27 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills Intermediate Sch</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>41 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills Primary Sch</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 2.1%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>47 97.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shamokin JHS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>56 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4 0.9%</td>
<td>1 0.2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>413 97.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the number of total ratings (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 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.

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?
The rating system for evaluations shall include the system devised by the PDE using the prescribed PDE forms. The method of appraisal consists of an administrator self-assessment, evaluator's appraisal and administrator appraisal.

c. Principal Promotions?

A mid-point conference is conducted to review the self-assessment and progress toward attainment of pre-established building level/professional goals. Prior to the final conference, administrators shall prepare a written progress report on their annual goals for mutual feedback between them and their supervisor.

d. Principal Retention and Removal?

--

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 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>Number Rated</th>
<th>Number Not Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 14.3 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</td>
<td>0 0 %</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 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.*