

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEA Name:

Central IU 10

AUN Number:

110000000

Address:

345 Link Rd West Decatur, PA 16878-9757

Name Superintendent or Chief School Administrator:

J. Hugh Dwyer, Executive Director

For Information Contact:

Susan Willis

Email:

swillis@ciu10.org

Phone:

814-342-0884 Extension 3064

TEACHER INFORMATION

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

The Central Intermediate Unit # 10 Professional Employee Evaluation Process and form are based upon Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching and the Pennsylvania Department of Education Employee Evaluation Forms. The four categories of the rating form are: Planning & Preparation, Instructional Environment, Instructional Delivery, and Professionalism. Descriptors in the form of a rubric have been developed for each category.

A. Planning & Preparation (Category I) – Through their knowledge of content and pedagogy skills in planning and preparation, professional employees make plans and set goals based on the content to be learned, their knowledge of students and their instructional context. Knowledge and understanding of special education techniques and strategies is an element of this category. Assessment techniques must also reflect the instructional goals and should serve to document student progress.

B. Instructional Environment (Category II) – Professional employees establish and maintain a purposeful and equitable environment for learning, in which students feel safe, valued, and respected by instituting routines and setting clear expectations for student behavior. This category consists of the interactions within the classroom or therapy setting. While interactions themselves are non-instructional, they are necessary for effective instruction, therapy, and/or assessment.

C. Instructional Delivery (Category III) – Professional employees, through their knowledge of content and pedagogy and skill in delivering instruction, engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies. This category represents the distinct elements of instruction.

D. Professionalism (Category IV) – Professionalism is demonstrated through qualities that characterize a professional person in aspects that occur in and beyond the classroom/building. This category ranges from self reflection and professional growth, to contributions made to the school and/or program, to contributions made to the profession as a whole. Components of this category include interactions with families, colleagues, administration, and the community. The descriptors on the rating form are listed in the form of a rubric to more fully describe the four categories of Planning & Preparation (I), Instructional Environment (II), Instructional Delivery (III), and Professionalism (IV). The applicable descriptors and all categories will be judged Proficient, Basic, or Unsatisfactory:

1. PROFICIENT: A rating of proficient means that the employee's performance with respect to the descriptor/category under consideration meets and/or exceeds acceptable standards.

2. BASIC: A rating of basic means that the employee's performance with respect to the descriptor/category under consideration is below acceptable standards.

3. UNSATISFACTORY: A rating of unsatisfactory means the employee's performance does not meet acceptable standards for the categorical and/or the total rating. An unsatisfactory rating will be substantiated by anecdotal records. In order to provide maximum opportunity for the rater to assess the employee's skills, multiple sources of evidence are utilized. Sources include observations of the employee and instructional environment as well as a review of documentation, such as a portfolio. A portfolio is strongly suggested for all professional employees and required of employees holding an Instructional I. The rater utilizes observation and/or review of documentation to determine a rating for each descriptor. Descriptors are not all-inclusive, but serve only as a guide. Therefore, it is not necessary to utilize all descriptors in each category in the rating process. Descriptors may be added as necessary. Due consideration is given in the rating process to the following factors: professional assignment, intellectual level of students and learning/behavioral problems, which might affect professional performance and factors over which the employee has no control. Using the appropriate descriptors listed in each category on the rating form, the rater evaluates employee performance for each relevant descriptor as proficient, basic, or unsatisfactory. For the purpose of the overall evaluation, proficient or basic is equivalent to satisfactory. Raters are reminded that descriptors do not have an assigned value and should be considered of equal importance. Determination of the categorical performance level is subject to the professional judgment of the rater. Evaluations are usually completed by the program director (i.e. Special Education Director, Assistant Special Education Director, Preschool Program Director, Nonpublic School Director), principal and/or supervisors (i.e. special education supervisor) who have direct supervision over the work of an employee who is being rated. Only those who are properly certified and authorized by the school code may do observation and ratings. The rater and the observer will always be the same person. A temporary professional employee is scheduled to be rated two times per year, once each semester, until the employee is awarded Instructional II certification. Employees holding an Instructional II, but new to their assignment or to the CIU # 10, are evaluated two times per year for up to three years with the direct supervisor determining when the employee is ready for the three year cycle. Current professional employees with prior year satisfactory evaluation are observed and rated once every three years. During the two years in which the employee is not rated the employee will be required to develop and implement a Professional Growth Plan. Professional Growth Plans enable the employee to explore, in depth, new ideas or interests in order to refine his/her instructional skills and to promote professional growth. Professional Growth Plans may involve the individual or a team pursuing a common goal that is valuable to the employee's professional growth and to student achievement. Successful completion of a Professional Growth Plan is considered a "Satisfactory" rating for the year. Administrators initially received training on the Danielson Framework Observation Program. In addition administrators participated in developing the CIU # 10 professional employee evaluation process. The process is reviewed regularly with administrators.

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

a. Teacher Development? Yes

While there is not a formal process for utilizing teacher performance evaluations to inform professional development, the Professional Education Committee frequently seeks input from the direct supervisors regarding employee needs. In addition the direct supervisor (i.e. principal, special education supervisor, etc.) must give prior approval for all employee requests for professional development.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

NA

c. Teacher Promotions? No

NA

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

Our intermediate unit follows the PA Code and dismisses teachers who have accumulated two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

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 CIU # 10 Professional Employee Evaluation Process and form are based upon Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching and the Pennsylvania Department of Education Employee Evaluation Forms. The four categories of the rating form are: Planning & Preparation, Instructional Environment, Instructional Delivery, and Professionalism. Descriptors in the form of a rubric have been developed for each category. Items are not weighted in the rubric.

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		8
Number Not Rated		
Total Number Employed		8

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			Unsatisfactory	NA	Basic	NA	NA	Proficient
Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory			Unsatisfactory	NA	Satisfactory	NA	NA	Satisfactory
Central IU 10	8	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	8 100 %
Totals	8	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	8 100%

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:

In July/August, each CIU # 10 Administrator is required to develop his/her major goals and objectives for the new school year. They are reviewed with the appropriate Division Head and then serve as focal points for direction of work. The performance evaluation will include a review centered on the degree of achievement of these goals. In conducting the actual performance evaluations, these major facets are among those considered: 1. The Job Description, which spells out the individual's Duties and Responsibilities; 2. Major Goals and Objectives and the degree of their achievement; and 3. Performance as measured by the Administrative Performance Appraisal Instrument in carrying out the above. There are five categories within this instrument: a. Administration and Supervision; b. Organization and Planning; c. Leadership and Staff Development; d. Communications and Relationship with Staff and Client; e. Problem Solving and Decision Making. The actual evaluation consists of a written narrative prepared by the administrator's immediate supervisor focusing on the major facets.

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

a. Principal Development? Yes

While there is not a formal process for utilizing the principal performance evaluation to inform professional development, the principal's immediate supervisor does use the annual evaluation to guide decision making as to which professional development requests will be encouraged and/or approved.

b. Principal Compensation? No

NA

c. Principal Promotions? No

NA

d. Principal Retention and Removal? Yes

Our intermediate unit follows the PA Code and dismisses administrators who have accumulated two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

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)? 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

NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

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

NA

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Rating System		No
Number Rated	1	
Number Not Rated	_____	
Total Number Employed	1	
	=====	

LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

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