

Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Information
Individual LEA Data
For the 2009-10 Rating Period

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Collegium CS

AUN Number:

124153320

Address:

535 James Hance Court Exton, PA 19341

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

William D. Winters

For Information Contact:

Beth Jones

Email:

bjones@ccs.us

Phone:

610-903-1300, ext. 612

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

Collegium uses an alternative evaluation form to evaluate our teachers. The Collegium-developed form is based on a variety of effective teaching methodologies and supporting research, including the work of: Harry Wong, Wiggins and McTighe's Understanding by Design/Backward Design and Madeline Hunter. We use the indicators on these forms to help our principals as they evaluate the teachers during semi-annual observations of those with at least one year of experience and during the three annual observations of new teachers and teachers new to Collegium. Teachers who are identified as needing improvement are observed with increased frequency along with intense mentoring/coaching between observations. Additional individual professional development is available for teachers who are found to need improvement through the evaluation process. The evaluation form includes four sections: Methodology, Planning, Classroom Environment and Management, and Professional Responsibilities. Each line item in a section is rated at one of 4 levels: Level 1 = Unsatisfactory; Level 2 = Basic, needs some improvement; Level 3 = Proficient; and Level 4 = Distinguished, no improvement needed. Collegium uses the evaluation system to inform salary, bonus, retention and promotion decisions.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

Areas of need, as indicated on the evaluation form, show a Principal areas of needed development for an individual teacher, as well as showing areas of need across the school. Once needs are determined, professional development plans are developed. Also, areas of superiority are noted by principals who then utilize that teacher in that area as a model. Our ACT 48 inservice selections are often as a result of needs demonstrated during evaluations.

b. Teacher Compensation? Yes

We use a merit pay system for raises and bonuses. Better evaluation = better raise and bonus. Poor performance = little if any raise/bonus. We do not use a salary chart for raises.

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes

Performance evaluations are reviewed when a teacher is being considered for a lateral or vertical move. A teacher with poor evaluations is not going to be considered for advancement. A teacher with distinguished evaluation scores will be considered for advanced opportunities.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

If evaluations are good, teachers continue to remain employed. If evaluations are consistently poor (unsatisfactory) and satisfactory progress has not been made by the teacher in the area(s) of need determined by the principal, the teacher will not remain employed. We work with our teachers to show them areas of needed growth and give them time to improve, but if improvement is not demonstrated, they are not retained.

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)? More than twice a year

b. Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Twice a year

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

NA

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

125

Number Not Rated

Total Number Employed

125

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Alternate Approved Evaluation System:

	Total Employed	Not Rated	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
	(Denominator)	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %	(Numerator) %
RatingTitle			Level 1 = Unsatisfactory	Level 2 = Basic	N/A	N/A	Level 3 = Proficient	Level 4 = Distinguished
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	NA	NA	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Collegium CS	125	0 0%	0 0%	2 1.6%	0 0%	0 0%	95 76%	28 22.4%
Totals	125	0 0%	0 0%	2 1.6%	0 0%	0 0%	95 76%	28 22.4%

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:

Collegium uses an internally developed form to evaluate our Principals. The CEO evaluates the Principals. Principals are evaluated three times during their first year and annually in subsequent years. Principals who are identified as needing improvement are observed with increased frequency along with intense mentoring/coaching between observations. Additional individual professional development is available for Principals who are found to need improvement through the evaluation process. The evaluation form includes five sections: Curriculum/Academic Program, School Management, Organization/Decision-Making/Leadership, Human Relations, and Professional Responsibilities. Each section is rated at one of 4 levels: Level 1 = Unsatisfactory; Level 2 = Basic, needs some improvement; Level 3 = Proficient; and Level 4 = Distinguished, no improvement needed. Collegium uses the evaluation system to inform salary, bonus, retention and promotion decisions. Additionally, as a component of the evaluation process, annual surveys are completed by faculty/staff where they assess the performance of the Principals with whom they interact. The rating achieved on this survey is a component of the Principals' raise/bonus calculation.

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

a. Principal Development?

Yes

If it is noted that a principal is in need of improvement in any areas, an individual professional development plan will be developed tied to that area of need.

bPrincipal Compensation? Yes

We use a merit pay system for raises and bonuses.Better evaluation = better raise and bonus. Poor performance = little if any raise/bonus. We do not use a salary chart for raises.

c. Principal Promotions? NA

NA

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

If evaluations are good, principals continue to remain employed. If evaluations are consistantly poor (unsatisfactory) and satisfactory progress has not been made by the principal in the area(s) of need determined by the CEO the principal will not remain employed. We work with our principals to show them areas of needed growth and give them time to improve, but if improvement is not demonstrated, they are not retained.

Does the LEA principal 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 Principals (Less than 3 Years)? More than twice a year

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

NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Rating System	Standard
Number Rated	2
Number Not Rated	_____
Total Number Employed	2

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) %
RatingTitle			Level 1 = Unsatisfactory	Level 2 = Basic			Level 3 = Proficient	Level 4 = Distinguished
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	UNSATISFACTORY	NA	NA	Satisfactory	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**